21992

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR...Paul Gerard Tiessen...

TITLE OF THESIS...Cinema: The Medium as Metaphor
...in the Work of Wyndham Lewis
...and Dorothy Richardson...

UNIVERSITY...of...Alberta...

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED...Ph.D...

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED...1972...

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)...Paul Tiessen...

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
...Dept. of English...
...U. of Manitoba...
...Winnipeg, Man...

DATED...October 1...1972.

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CINEMA: THE MEDIUM AS METAPHOR IN THE WORK OF WYNDHAM LEWIS AND DOROTHY RICHARDSON

by

© PAUL GERARD TIESSEN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1973

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Cinema: The Medium as Metaphor in the Work of Wyndham Lewis and Dorothy Richardson" submitted by Paul Gerard Tiessen in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Sheila Watson

Supervisor Wilfred Watson

Paul Swartz

Norman Yates

B. David George

Hugo McPherson

External Examiner

Date September 26 19 73

ABSTRACT

The development of the silent film occurred at the same time as the development of the stream-of-consciousness novel. Since then the criticism of the English novel has been marked by the efforts of critics to use the technical language of the film-makers to explain new techniques in fiction. Little attempt has been made to assess the effect of the medium on the sensibility of the writers themselves, or to consider the reactions recorded by writers to the presence of the cinema, to its effects on the collective consciousness of people, and to the various and sometimes conflicting possibilities for fiction inherent in cinematic techniques.

Part One of this dissertation presents historical and critical backgrounds which establish the rationale for my choice of the work of Wyndham Lewis and of Dorothy Richardson for particular study in this context. I discuss here the literary criticism which has reflected attempts to define the modern novel by means of a rhetoric based on film-metaphor. I call particular attention to the approach of the critic Bruce Morrissette. This critic in his appeal to the critical writing of the artist himself--in this case Alain Robbe-Grillet--has suggested the approach taken in this study. The strength of this approach is tested by contrasting assessments of film made by traditional writers like H. G. Wells and Arnold Bennett with those made by Virginia Woolf, whose essays on film and on the novel link the stream-of-consciousness novel with the

"dream architecture" of film--and both with the transcript of subjective reality. These elements both Lewis and Richardson associated in their thought about the novel and film. Where they differed was in their aesthetic allegiance and in their degree of awareness of the effect of the film medium on consciousness.

Part Two of this dissertation analyzes Richardson's film aesthetic and considers it in relation to her views concerning artistic experience. Here I proceed to show how her film aesthetic lends itself to an understanding of the style and structure of her novel-sequence, Pilgrimage. Lewis took up a counter-position and extended and, I think, clarified the film-metaphor used by Dorothy Richardson.

Part Three deals with Lewis's belief that camera-eye vision and what he called the external approach in fiction had great potential for the satirist. Yet at the same time he noted that camera-eye vision and the presence of the cinema had contributed to contemporary preoccupation with a psychology of "amputated spaces" and "serial-groups" reflected in the "writing-from-the-inside-method." Lewis's theoretical exploration of the cinema and its bearing on contemporary art, philosophy, and culture were transformed into fiction in many of his novels. It is, however, in relation to The Childermass that these explorations are seen most clearly as guides for interpretation of his themes and techniques. His highly critical and often polemic approach to the novel, contrasted with Dorothy Richardson's very personal response, provides invaluable insights into the dimensions of the problems involved in the development of a critical rhetoric which will include both forms of expression, novel and film.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I should like to express my gratitude to the Canada Council, for its support during the writing of this dissertation.

CONTENTS

PART ONE: NOVELISTS AND THE CINEMA 1

A. Film Aesthetics of the Stream-of-Consciousness Novel: The Novelist's Perspective 2

B. The Novelist's Environment: The Silent Cinema (1895-1930) 9

C. The Meanings of the Cinema (1): Perspectives of Modern Novelists and Perspectives of Traditional Novelists 20

D. The Meanings of the Cinema (2): The Central Perspective of the Modern Novelists and Divers Like-minded Contemporaries and Critics 34

E. Novel and Film: The Novelist's Perspective 48

PART TWO: DOROTHY RICHARDSON'S LITERARY EXPLORATIONS: THE MIMING OF CINEMA 52

A. Dorothy Richardson and the Cinema: Biography and Bibliography in brief 53

B. Richardson's Aesthetic (1): The Cinema and the Spectator 62

C. Richardson's Aesthetic (2): The Pilgrimage and Life's Cinematographic Show 71

D. Modes of Seeing (1): Masculine and Feminine Perception 78

E. Modes of Seeing (2): Perceiving and Being Perceived 87

F. Sight and Insight (1): Miriam 94

G. Sight and Insight (2): The Reader 104

H. Miriam's Pilgrimage: The Sight and Sense of Self . 120

PART THREE: WYNDHAM LEWIS'S LITERARY EXPLORATIONS: THE PARODYING OF CINEMA 138

A. Wyndham Lewis: The World of Cinema 139

B. Twentieth-Century Ways of Seeing (1): Wyndham Lewis 150

C. Twentieth-Century Ways of Seeing (2): Technological Man 155

D. Common-sense Perception versus the Isolation of the Camera Eye 160

E. Cinema as Dream (1): Surrealism 167

F. Cinema as Dream (2): Lady Fredigonde Follett . . . 174

G. Cinema as Satire: Lewis's External Approach 179

H. Cinema as Mechanism (1): Henri Bergson 188

I. Cinema as Mechanism (2): Wyndham Lewis 195

J. *The Childermass* (1): The Cinema and the Massacre of the Innocents 206

K. *The Childermass* (2): The Cinema and the Remembrance of Things Past 222

L. The Phoenix: Rebirth in the Age of the Cinema . . . 233

NOTES 236

LIST OF WORKS CITED 286

PART ONE

NOVELISTS AND THE CINEMA

I CANNOT REPEAT THIS TOO OFTEN ANYONE IS OF ONE'S PERIOD AND THIS OUR PERIOD WAS UNDOUBTEDLY THE PERIOD OF THE CINEMA. . . . AND EACH OF US IN OUR OWN WAY ARE BOUND TO EXPRESS WHAT THE WORLD IN WHICH WE ARE LIVING IS DOING.
(Gertrude Stein, 1935)[1]

A. FILM AESTHETICS OF THE STREAM-OF-CONSCIOUSNESS NOVEL: THE NOVELIST'S PERSPECTIVE

THE WHOLE WORLD SEEMS TO TURN ON A REEL. (Vachel Lindsay, 1915)[2]

The stream-of-consciousness convention in the English novel during the two decades between 1910 and 1930 parallels the development of the silent film. Literary critics frequently have pointed out that there are, not only historically but also aesthetically, obvious relations between these two art forms belonging to quite dissimilar media.

The stream-of-consciousness novel, although restricted to the medium of the printed word, tends to emphasize the non-verbal range of a character's mental and emotional activity. Primarily by means of visual images the novelist establishes what Wyndham Lewis called an "inner cinema" in the mind of the character, a "cinema" which in effect the reader can "watch" through the character's inner eye. The spectator of the silent film likewise sees images defined by an eye not his own--that of the film apparatus. He sees a silent visual world which is, as Dorothy Richardson described it, "intimate as thought."[3]

In the stream-of-consciousness novel traditional narrative structure and verbal logic are abandoned in favour of conventions which suggest the private alogical meandering of a relatively passive mind, one which is not necessarily intent upon expressing itself formally, and which can reveal through imagery various levels of articulation. The predominance of a kind of dream logic in such novels parallels the picturing of visual objects in the ever-changing temporal and spatial contexts of most films.

That the stream-of-consciousness experimentation in the novel might have proceeded along certain lines without the historical occurrence of the cinema is unquestionably true, for the forces which facilitated the great experiments in literature and in virtually all the traditional arts during this period of time were diversely and complexly interrelated. However, the importance of confrontations with the cinema can be estimated through the novelists' own reactions to the cinema. Writers who were dissatisfied with traditional forms and who experimented with new fictional forms were often keenly interested in the cinema--in its potentialities and shortcomings, and in its implications for the other arts.

Two such writers were Wyndham Lewis and Dorothy Richardson. Richardson was an advocate and practitioner of the stream-of-consciousness method, specifically the interior monologue, which she saw as being related to the cinema. Lewis, who also related this literary convention to the cinema, adamantly opposed its widespread use. Both writers responded directly to the cinema, Richardson in essays written specifically in response to the new medium, Lewis in statements scattered especially throughout his polemical works. Also, the response of both to the new medium is reflected in the themes and style of their own novels, in which they extended the boundaries of fiction as they explored the implications of the cinema for art and life in general, and for the novel in particular.

* * *

The majority of English literary critics, especially in the early days of the development of the film, either simply ignored the cinema and its possible influence on the imagination of the serious novelist, or occasionally contented themselves with diatribes deploring the subversive effects of the movies, especially "Hollywood" movies, upon the cultural level of the country as a whole. The public--at least a certain portion of it--often followed suit. For example, a certain Mr. Justice MacKinnon was reputed to have spoken these words in the King's Bench in 1929: "I have always regarded the film industry as the greatest menace that has ever arisen to literature, art, and civilisation."[4] Few literary critics, until very recently, have taken any note of novelists' responses to the cinema, or of the significance of such responses. Just as few have concerned themselves with developing an aesthetic to meet the needs of the critic confronted with the fact that the serious experimentation which characterized German, Russian, and French films particularly was paralleled in Britain by significant experiments in the form of the novel.

A small number of critics, it is true, by isolating certain techniques which are regarded as cinematic have attempted to gauge the effect of film on the novel by finding instances of similar techniques in the novels which they examine. Robert Humphrey, for example, speaking in his book, Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel, of "devices for controlling the movement of stream-of-consciousness fiction," pointed to "a group that may be analogically termed 'cinematic' devices." Along with what he saw as the primary device of montage, he catalogued the "secondary devices" of multiple-view, slow-up, fade-out, cutting, close-up, panorama, and flash-back.[5] In his book, Time and the Novel, A. A. Mendilow, listing "devices borrowed from the film or common to the novel and the film," mentioned similar aspects: montage, the angle, superimposition, speed-up, ralenti, flash-back, close-up, fade-in, and fade-out.[6] In a book on the work of James Joyce, Robert Ryf analyzed Joyce's novels in terms of what he called "approximations" to six standard motion picture techniques: montage, superimposition, the overlap dissolve, flashback, controlled perspective or camera angle, and pictorial lighting.[7]

Such categorizations of techniques, although they are sometimes imposed in a mechanical fashion which has a debilitative effect on the possibilities of the analogy, are important as initial contributions to the development of a combined critical rhetoric of novel and film. They lead to questions which have not in the past been raised. In terms of personal and cultural aesthetic contexts, what is the attitude of the novelist himself toward the film as a medium? If it is suggested or shown that a novelist actually adapts film techniques for use as literary techniques, then what is his own attitude toward such transposition? When technique itself functions in the modern novel as a kind of metaphor, what is the precise meaning of the adapted film-technique in terms of its role as literary metaphor?

Very recently, to be sure, literary critics have become quite aware of these areas of interest. While Robert Richardson touched upon them only lightly in his Literature and Film (1969), Edward Murray took novelists' film-thoughts and film-involvements into basic consideration in his book, The Cinematic Imagination: Writers and the Motion Pictures (1972). In this work he paid special attention to writers whom he classified as stream-of-consciousness novelists, Joyce, Woolf, and Faulkner, as well as to Dreiser, Dos Passos, Fitzgerald, West, Hemingway, Steinbeck, Greene, and Robbe-Grillet. The reactions to film of some of these novelists has been anthologized in a collection of essays, Authors on Film (1972), edited by Harry Geduld. The recent interest in the effect of the novelist's response to film is reflected, too, in one of the expressed intentions of the new periodical, Literature/Film Quarterly (ed. Thomas L. Erskine; first issue, January 1973), to publish articles on "authors' attitudes toward film and film adaptations."[8]

Strangely enough the polemical and fictional works of Wyndham Lewis have been overlooked by critics who have tried to establish points of reference between novel and film. During the 1920's Lewis used the cinema as a central metaphor in his analyses and parodies of the stream-of-consciousness novel. Similarly, the work of Dorothy Richardson, who was a most prolific assessor of the new medium of film and a pioneer in the use of the stream-of-consciousness technique, has been related to film only tentatively by literary critics; although indeed, it was with reference to Richardson's fiction that the term, stream-of-consciousness, was first used as a literary label--by May Sinclair in 1918.[9]

This study concentrates, then, on the work of these two British novelists, whose thinking on the significance of the cinema in the context of its own time provides in each case a reflexive backdrop against which aspects of their own fiction can be seen. Each created in an individual way in fiction aspects of what he or she saw as the cinematic experience. Although Richardson's novel, Pilgrimage, provides no explicit statements about film, it reveals a technical mimicry of cinema. Specifically, its style bears the stamp of the quite coherent film aesthetic which emerges from Richardson's many writings on film, especially those from 1927 to 1933. Novels such as Lewis's The Childermass and The Apes of God contain explicit references to cinema. These stress the importance of its role at the thematic level, where it operates as metaphor, and relate to Lewis's references to film in his polemical works. Examination of both Lewis's and Richardson's interest in film, then, illuminates both theme and technique in their own work. Their extended preoccupation with film, too, provides a gauge to examine the various ways in which British novelists at the time were responding to the presence of the new medium. It also provides a guide for the development of a critical rhetoric to deal with both novel and film.

B. THE NOVELIST'S ENVIRONMENT: THE SILENT CINEMA (1895-1930)

WHATEVER DID WE USED TO DO WHEN THERE WAS NO PICTURES?
(Dorothy Richardson, 1927)[10]

James Joyce was relatively early among writers in showing any kind of overt awareness of the presence of the cinema. In 1909 he returned from Trieste to Ireland to act, at least for a short period of time, as the manager of Dublin's first movie theatre, the Cinematograph Volta.[11] Critics at times have pointed to this event to support their assertions that Joyce was the first to recognize the significance of the cinema for the experimental novelist. Murray, for example, wrote in the introduction to The Cinematic Imagination that with "James Joyce as a guide, a new breed of fiction writer would soon attempt to find out the extent to which [great literature] could accommodate the technique of the film without sacrificing its own unique powers."[12]

Murray's statement is typical of an oversimplification which has focused on Joyce and has overlooked the relation of other writers to the cinema. Lewis and Richardson, for instance, independently of each other and of Joyce, also recognized at an early stage of their work the importance of the cinema. The first version of Lewis's The Enemy of the Stars, a work which he referred to as "a kind of play,"[13] but which might more appropriately be described as a fantastic literary evocation of cinema forms, appeared in the first number of Lewis's periodical, *Blast*, in 1914. *Pointed Roofs*, the first volume of Richardson's series of "cinematic" novels, *Pilgrimage*, was published in 1915.

Both Lewis and Richardson wrote all of their major fiction in the context of their awareness that the world itself was changing and that man's perception of himself was being altered by the accessibility of new communications technologies. Lewis saw that the rise of the cinema, as well as the development of the telephone, the telegraph, the radio--the mass media--separated western man's immediate present from all of his past by altering radically the coordinates of his environment. "The world war (1914-1918)," he wrote," is like a mountain range in the historic landscape. It is, at once, composed of mountains of criminal destructiveness, and a piling-up of tremendous creative inventiveness. Those four years marked in fact the mass-arrival of the cinema, . . . etc. This is, as it were, a perpendicular wall of great height, a mountainous barrier, behind which the past world lies."[14] The arrival of any new technological forms, Lewis continually emphasized, forces man to restructure his perception of his own experience. Part of the role of the artist is to adjust man's relationship to his environment. In this regard Lewis not only heralded the arrival of the new medium of cinema, but also documented the nature of its current and potential impact on man's relation with himself.

Dorothy Richardson also showed an awareness of the part played by the cinema and other communications technologies in bringing about a new era, an era of "world wide conversations."[15] Unlike Lewis, who regarded the situation with critical caution, Richardson demonstrated willing acceptance of the new institution. "So here we all are," she exclaimed. "All over London, all over England, all over the world. Together in this strange hospice risen overnight, rough and provisional but guerdon none the less of a world in the making. Never before was such all-embracing hospitality save in an ever-open church where kneels madame, . . . where the dustman's wife bustles in. . . ."[16]

Sensitive to their own times, artists such as Lewis and Richardson perceived in a variety of ways the revolution which media like the cinema were causing in the actual world, and in the thinking of writers themselves. A statement made in 1928 by the poet, H. D., summarizes the sense of the inevitable effect the cinema was having on common consciousness and on the imagination of the writer: "the world of the film to-day (there is no getting away from it) is no longer the world of the film, it is the world."[17]

* * *

A brief survey of the development of film as industry, as entertainment, and as art, especially during the period of the silent film, will illuminate the milieu in which novelists contemporary to Lewis (1882-1957) and Richardson (1873-1957) found themselves. As early as 1895 the public in England, as well as France and the United States, had the opportunity to see the first moving pictures projected life-size upon sheets of cloth. Movies occupied, at first, small portions of programs in which other forms of popular entertainment were featured. The first films were shown at fairs, in cafés, or in music-halls. With the coming of longer films in the first years of the new century permanent movie houses were established.

The use of films for fictional narration, however crude, had begun to develop by 1900, especially with the work of George Méliès in France. In 1903, Edwin S. Porter's one-reel, eight-minute thriller, The Great Train Robbery, now considered a classic example of the narrative films of the period, appeared. During the early 1900's most of the techniques which have come to constitute what is often called the language of film were already in use, even though they were often introduced inadvertently through the practical exigencies of film-making. Parallel montage with its discontinuities of narrative space and time, camera mobility, and close-ups, for example, seemed almost inherent forms of expression in the new medium.

By 1910 the film industry, with its system of world-wide distribution of films, was already well established and highly organized. Film-going was growing steadily in popularity in England. By 1914 over 1,000 cinema theatres were in use in England, each town with a population of over 100,000 having, on the average, over twenty such theatres. In 1910 over 4,000 new films, coming from a number of countries, were released in England. By 1913, the number of new films released in England in a one year period had expanded to over 7,000. French films, together with American films, accounted for over two-thirds of the new releases in England in 1910. Within ten years American films alone were to greatly outnumber the films of any other nation which were shown commercially in England.[18]

A. J. P. Taylor has given an interesting account of the effect of the cinema on the people of England: "The cinema changed the pattern of English life, particularly for the lower middle class. It took people from their homes; eclipsed both church and public house; spread romantic, but by no means trivial, values. Women joined their husbands in enjoyment, as they had never done at football matches or other public pleasures. The cinema was the greatest educative force of the early twentieth century. Yet highly educated people saw in it only vulgarity and the end of old England."[19]

Despite the general resistance of most highly educated people, however, a minority of their number began to pay attention to at least certain films. Some were attracted by the comedies of Charlie Chaplin, who was known universally by 1914 and who in 1915, in a two-reel film which was approximately his fourtieth movie to appear in just over a year, achieved mythic status as "the tramp." Chaplin evoked what Arthur Knight has called "the enthusiasm of the literati." Knight has pointed out in his book, The Liveliest Art, that by the early 1920's Chaplin's pictures had created "a cult with the sophisticates."[20]

During the 1920's film--especially many of the films made in Germany, Russia, and France--developed significantly as a serious art form. As such, it satisfied the contemporary demands of modern art to be both international and European. Film was ideally suited to a position in the mainstream of experimental art, however, only as long as it was silent, for captions could easily be replaced by those of another language. Bryher has recalled artists' attitudes to the international aura associated with the new medium: "The [silent] film was new, it had no earlier associations and it offered occasionally, in an episode or single shot, some framework for our dreams. We felt we could state our convictions honorably in this twentieth-century form of art and it appealed to the popular internationalism of those so few years because 'the silents' offered a single language across Europe."[21]

In England the desire to see the artistically significant productions of Germany, Russia, and France, which were not readily available at the conventional, commercially-oriented theatres, led to the formation in 1925 of the London Film Society. Roger Fry, Julian Huxley, Augustus John, Bernard Shaw, and H. G. Wells were among the Society's founding members; Iris Barry was its manager. Oxford and Cambridge universities formed film societies which early in the 1920's concerned themselves not only with screening but also with production of films.[22] In the summer of 1928 the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion Cinema in London opened, and specialized for two years in screening important foreign films. Its audience was composed "roughly of three different classes: the intelligenzia, the intellectual amateur who likes to follow new art movements, and the ordinary, average middle-class business man who doesn't go to the cinema as a rule because he does not like the fare provided for 'the masses.'"[23] By 1930 the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion was compelled by American owners to screen the new talkies, a step which was accompanied by the loss of its status as a significant venture in the art world.

Some of the internationally prominent German films which played at the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion included Karl Gruene's _The Street_ (1923), F. W. Murnau's _The Last Laugh_ (1924), and Henrik Galeen's _The Student of Prague_ (1926).[24] Huntly Carter has noted some of the approximately

150 films which were screened at the Film Society in the 1920's: in 1926--Robert Wiene's The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (Germany, 1919), Fritz Lang's Dr. Mabuse (Germany, 1922), and Erich von Stroheim's Greed (U. S., 1923); in 1927--G. W. Pabst's The Joyless Street (Germany, 1925) and Jean Renoir's Nana (France, 1926); in 1928--Pudovkin's Mother (Russia, 1926); and in 1929--Pudovkin's The End of St. Petersburg (Russia, 1927) and Eisenstein's The Battleship Potemkin (Russia, 1925).[25] The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, a self-consciously, technically radical expressionistic film which marked the commencement of a rich period of film-making in Germany in the 1920's, contributed more than any other European film to the cinema's growing prestige among people interested in the contemporary art movements. Knight has written that "postwar artists and intellectuals, looking upon the movies for the first time as something more than a mere entertainment for the masses, found in Caligari a film that they could safely admire. Its unconventional story, its Freudian overtones and, above all, its obviously 'artistic' settings (related both to the stage work of the expressionists and to the experiments of the cubist painters) won for it an acclaim that was actually somewhat in excess of its contributions to the growing art."[26]

At the end of the 1920's the sound-film replaced the silent film as a commercially viable product. Critics who had been sceptical of the artistic claims of the silent cinema remained antagonistic to the new form, for in its first years the talkie floundered aesthetically. Most serious supporters of the silent film at first assumed a hostile attitude to the dissolution of this now highly developed form of art and entertainment, and to its displacement by the new and at first awkward mixed-media form. Of course, the so-called silent films had not, in fact, been without musical accompaniment even before sound-on-film became commercially feasible. Pianos, organs, and even orchestras were not uncommon during the last decade of the silent film era. With the talkie, however, the demands of sensitive, relatively immobile sound equipment forced the camera to forego its freedom to develop further a flexible cinematic language, and the cinema resumed its earliest role of being little more than photographed drama.

Responding to the spirit of experimentation in art, Eisenstein, together with his colleagues, Pudovkin and Alexandrov, accepted the aesthetic challenges of sound-on-film, at least in theory. In 1928 these Russian directors issued a statement which they designed to govern the aesthetic principles of the sound-film. Anticipating and fearing a degenerating line of development, from "talking films . . . in which sound-recording [would] proceed on a naturalistic level" to a period of "'highly cultured dramas' and other photographic performances of a theatrical sort," they pointed to the potential for new artistic achievements based on contemporary aesthetics:

> ONLY A CONTRAPUNTAL USE of sound in relation to the visual montage piece will afford a new potentiality of montage development and perfection.
>
> THE FIRST EXPERIMENTAL WORK WITH SOUND MUST BE DIRECTED ALONG THE LINE OF ITS DISTINCT NON-SYNCHRONIZATION WITH THE VISUAL IMAGES. And only such an attack will give the necessary palpability which will later lead to the creation of an ORCHESTRAL COUNTERPOINT of visual and aural images.
>
> . . . .
>
> The CONTRAPUNTAL METHOD of constructing the sound-film will not only not weaken the INTERNATIONAL CINEMA, but will bring its significance to unprecedented power and cultural height.[27]

If film-makers should treat sound as a montage element, the viewer's experience of the visual images would be enhanced. The imaginative response to the image would not be deadened as it would be if the image were cluttered with literal explanation. Indeed, sound could provide, the Russian directors optimistically pointed out, "an organic way out of a whole series of impasses" by removing the need for sub-titles and lengthy explanatory pieces, such as close-up shots of items such as letters.[28]

* * *

Regardless of whether it was the aesthetically sophisticated or the commercially popular film which affected the imaginations of modern writers, it is evident that they were virtually bound to reveal in at least some way in their own work something of the new and pervasive medium which was everywhere in their midst. Professor J. Isaacs, writing in his book, An Assessment of Twentieth-

Century Literature (1951), has summarized:

> [Twentieth century novelists] are agreed about one thing, the profound influence of the cinema on modern fiction, whether by giving the novelist a panoramic view from a height, or by forcing him to break his work up into tiny scenes, or by insisting on a narrative style in which not dialogue, which is the smallest part of a talkie, but carefully balanced fragments are united into a resultant impression, or in a score of ways for which we have not yet evolved a conscious label. It is not merely the daily commercial cinema, which has the same kind of effect as the newspaper or the novelette, but the serious films, from Russia, Germany, France and Italy, which we used to show at the [London] Film Society or could be seen later at the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion, . . . and can be seen now in the whole network of film societies all over the country: Dr. Caligari, Potemkin, The General Line, Storm over Asia, Earth, Warning Shadows. . . . These are as much part of the background of literature as the novels from abroad.[29]

C. THE MEANINGS OF THE CINEMA (1): PERSPECTIVES OF MODERN NOVELISTS AND PERSPECTIVES OF TRADITIONAL NOVELISTS

YOU WILL SEE THAT THIS LITTLE CLICKING CONTRAPTION WITH THE REVOLVING HANDLE WILL MAKE A REVOLUTION IN OUR LIFE--IN THE LIFE OF WRITERS. IT IS A DIRECT ATTACK ON THE OLD METHODS OF LITERARY ART. WE SHALL HAVE TO ADAPT OURSELVES TO THE SHADOWY SCREEN AND TO THE COLD MACHINE. A NEW FORM OF WRITING WILL BE NECESSARY. I HAVE THOUGHT OF THAT AND I FEEL WHAT IS COMING. (Leo Tolstoy, 1908)[30]

Broadly marked outlines distinguish the preoccupations of the experimental novelists who were interested in the cinema from those of the older, established novelists of the period. Writers, for instance, such as Dorothy Richardson and Virginia Woolf felt that novelists had much to learn from the unique possibilities for expression inherent in the new medium. On the other hand novelists like H. G. Wells (1866-1946) and Arnold Bennett (1867-1931) as well as playwright Bernard Shaw (1856-1950)[31] were moved merely by a pragmatic desire to influence the narrative or story-telling role of the movies rather than by any sensitivity to the techniques by which film was at once exploring and creating modes of consciousness. The older writers often saw cinema merely as an extension of the familiar techniques of the novel or the play.

It is informative to consider briefly Virginia Woolf's thoughts about film in the light of the thoughts of Bennett and Wells and, briefly, of John Galsworthy (1867-

1933), the novelists with whose fiction Woolf contrasted her own and Joyce's in some of her writing of the mid-1920's. In terms of their varying views of the cinema, the reactions on the one hand of Woolf, who explicitly rejected the writing styles and literary values of Wells, Bennett, and Galsworthy, and the reactions on the other hand especially of Wells and Bennett, act virtually as a gauge of their respective attitudes toward artistic conventions and values in media other than the cinema.

One dominant contrast between the reaction of Woolf and of what might be considered the common reactions of the older writers relates to the deliberate stressing and emphasizing of the subjective side of man, an area for the exploration of which Woolf (as well as Richardson and Lewis) saw the film-medium as being uniquely appropriate.[32] In her writing about both traditional and modern literature, Woolf had taken exception to what she saw as the negligence of the older "materialist" writers. They were "concerned not with the spirit but with the body,"[33] she claimed. Woolf insisted on forms and techniques which could reveal, as it were, the subjective aspect of a fictional character and evoke the subjective response of the reader's imagination. The older writers, she said, were concerned only with establishing the solidity of the external and mundane world. She stated that in their books "life escapes." She illustrated her argument by turning to

Ulysses: "In contrast with those whom we have called materialists, Mr. Joyce is spiritual; he is concerned at all costs to reveal the flickerings of that innermost flame which flashes its messages through the brain, and in order to preserve it he disregards with complete courage whatever seems to him adventituous, whether it be probability, or coherence, or any other of these signposts which for generations have served to support the imagination of a reader when called upon to imagine what he can neither touch nor see."[34]

In her essay, "The Movies and Reality" (1926),[35] Woolf's thinking about the potential of the cinema for developing what she saw as its inherent strengths is, in principle, a continuation of her thinking about the possibilities for the novel. The leading novelists, she had insisted in her writings on the novel, missed what she called "reality:" "Admitting the vagueness which afflicts all criticism of novels, let us hazard the opinion that for us at this moment the form of fiction most in vogue more often misses than secures the thing we seek. Whether we call it life or spirit, truth or reality, this, the essential thing, has moved off, or on, and refuses to be contained any longer in such ill-fitting vestments as we provide."[36] Most films, Virginia Woolf lamented in "The Movies and Reality," also missed such a reality, even though the film medium was suited to capturing it. In describing the weaknesses of the conventional cinema, Woolf wrote that if the brain of the viewer should begin to assist the eye in actually analyzing the people and objects which were projected onto the screen, the brain would see at once "that they have taken on a quality which does not belong to the simple photograph of real life. They have become not more beautiful, in the sense in which pictures are beautiful, but shall we call it (our vocabularly is miserably insufficient) more real, or real with a different reality from that which we perceived in daily life? We behold them as they are when we have no part in it. As we gaze we seem to be removed from the pettiness of actual existence."[37] It was, Woolf said, because the brain had been lulled into a non-participatory dullness and only the eye--"the ordinary eye, the English unaesthetic eye," she called it, ". . . a simple mechanism"[38]--registered the images on the screen, that a proper reality was absent from most films: "the eye licks it all up instantaneously, and the brain, agreeably titillated, settles down to watch things happening without bestirring itself to think."[39]

However, there was, Woolf posited, an abstract or symbolical language which would free cinema from a slavish and ostensibly literal adherence to a world of awkwardly photographed externals: "For instance, at a performance of Doctor Caligari the other day, a shadow shaped like a tadpole suddenly appeared at one corner of the screen. It swelled to an immense size, quivered, bulged, and sank back again into nonentity. For a moment it seemed to embody some monstrous, diseased imagination of the lunatic's brain. For a moment it seemed as if thought could be conveyed by shape more effectively than by words."[40] The shadow, which had appeared accidentally in the picture, led Woolf to suggest a radical development of the subjective potential of the cinema: "if a shadow at a certain moment can suggest so much more than the actual gestures and words of men and women in a state of fear, it seems plain that the cinema has within its grasp innumerable symbols for emotions that have so far failed to find expression."[41] Framing a question which recalls her description of the work of Joyce as "concerned at all costs to reveal the flickerings of that innermost flame which flashes its messages through the brain," she asked: "Is there . . . some secret language which we feel and see, but never speak, and, if so, could this be made visible to the eye?"[42]

Apparently unaware of contemporary experimentations in abstract film on the continent,[43] Woolf provided the response to her question by suggesting a need for visual symbols which, like the unexpected shadow she had seen in The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, would probably be "quite unlike the real objects which we see before us:" "Something abstract, something which moves with controlled and conscious art, something which calls for the very slightest help from words or music to make itself intelligible, yet justly uses them subserviently--of such movements and abstractions the films may, in time to come, be composed."[44] Such means for creating emotion and thought, means yet unexplored in what she saw as the conventions of the traditional novel and cinema alike, would release the potential of the cinema for creating an inner, thought-like reality, she said: "When some new symbol for expressing thought is found, the film-maker has enormous riches at his command. The exactitude of reality and its surprising power of suggestion are to be had for the asking."[45] Woolf, in a statement which parallels Eisenstein's views about the comparative potential of film and novel, envisioned a cinema whose powers for recreating the many levels of consciousness would exceed even those of the stream-of-consciousness novelist: "The most fantastic contrasts could be flashed before us with a speed which the writer can only toil after in vain; the dream architecture of arches and battlements, of cascades falling and fountains rising, which sometimes visits us in sleep or shapes itself in half-darkened rooms, could be realized before our waking eyes."[46]

Not surprisingly, the writers with whose values Woolf had taken exception hardly tended to look at film in a manner which could in any way be considered compatible with her hope for an inner "dream architecture." As "materialists," or, to use Huntly Carter's term, as "sociologists,"[47] their interest in the cinema generally involved a disregard for the aesthetic criteria of writers like Woolf. Galsworthy, for example, in responding to the question of whether film might be considered an art form, replied simply, "I couldn't be bothered with that."[48]

Arnold Bennett, who had had a number of his own works transcribed into film-scripts during the 1920's,[49] contributed some of his views on film in an essay written in 1927. While he could appreciate, he said, the aesthetic qualities of good photography and pictorial composition, he preferred to place greater importance on the quality of the story. He was disgruntled, he said, that he had "not yet seen a first-rate story told in a first-rate style on the screen." He maintained that "all the new stories, contrived _ad hoc_, are conventional, grossly sentimental, clumsy, and fatally impaired by poverty of invention. The screen has laid hands on some of the greatest stories in the world, and has cheapened, soiled, ravaged, and poisoned them by the crudest fatuities. This charge applies less to Germany than to other countries, and it applies most of all to America; but it applies to Germany in a very serious degree. Even Charlie Chaplin shows immensely less talent for devising a tale, and the incidents of a tale, than for any of the subsidiary branches of film-work."[50] All of any film-maker's creative energy was spent on graphic techniques, it seemed to Bennett, and none on the drama or story.

H. G. Wells set down most of his thoughts on film in his essay, "Film, the Art Form of the Future," the introduction to The King who was a King, a film-script he published in 1929. He, as well as Bennett, saw a need for accomplished novelists to influence the course of the film, and he apologized for the general reluctance which they had hitherto shown in adapting themselves to the demands of the new medium: "Within our own special limits we had learnt to handle considerable complexes of ideas and emotional developments; it was appalling to think of learning over again the conditions of a medium. We knew how to convey much that we had to say by a woven fabric of printed words or by scene and actor, fine 'lines' and preface assisting, and it was with extraordinary reluctance, if at all, that we could be won to admit that on the screen a greater depth of intimation, a more subtle and delicate fabric of suggestion, a completer beauty and power, might be possible than any our tried and trusted equipment could achieve."[51]

Wells, who claimed that in 1895 he and a Robert W. Paul had "initiated a patent application for a Time Machine that anticipated most of the stock methods and devices of the screen drama,"[52] saw in the cinema a medium which he thought would become the primary means of expression for younger novelists. The cinema was for him the successor of the novel and he, familiar with the "tried and trusted equipment" of the novelist, felt a direct responsibility in extending his talents to writing for the film. It was indeed literary equipment which provided the model for his, as well as for Bennett's, ideas about the cinema, a model which essentially retained the traditional values of narrative literary form. On the other hand, and notwithstanding the actual "literary-ness" of most movies, the modern novelists often saw in the film medium a model for their experiments in literature. In this regard the position of the modern novelists is stressed, for example, by Dorothy Richardson, who viewed Wells's declaration about the future of the film as a "direct challenge to all who value books."[53]

Although Wells claimed to acknowledge the possibilities of producing a "spectacle-music-drama" using non-natural and contrapuntal effects, he was unable to realize such effects in the film-script which accompanied his essay on the future of film. Taking his inspiration from Thomas Hardy's The Dynasts (1904), which he referred to as "that great unshot film,"[54] Wells produced a novel-like work which, he said, had been evoked by him "in an imaginary cinema theatre."[55] Wells's film, had it not remained unshot, would have made extensive use of music, but none of voice or dialogue, since sub-titles were to have been used to register speech. Stubbornly true to his conviction "that a hard, fairly complex argument can be stated more clearly and more effectively upon the screen than in any other way,"[56] Wells produced a heavy-handed script encumbered with sub-titles. The complex argument depended upon a cinematic treatment which approached that described by the playwright, James Barrie: "Barrie," Shaw remarked in 1924, "says that the film play of the future will have no pictures and will consist exclusively of subtitles."[57]

The film-theory of Bernard Shaw underlines with considerable severity the emphasis of novelists such as Bennett and Wells on transferring to the cinema what they believed to be the social function of the novel. The film like the novel should embody an ideological content. Indeed, Huntly Carter in his book, The New Spirit in the Cinema (1930), suggested that to portray the "spirit of England" in the movies, one "could not look for it in a better place than in the works of such eminent writers as Mr. Galsworthy, Mr. Arnold Bennett, Mr. H. G. Wells and Mr. Bernard Shaw. All four are sociologists, and as such capable of expressing the subject that the cinema should express."[58]

When the time came Shaw provided his own rationale for the sound-film since he wished to participate in the development by having his own works transposed into film-scripts for talking-film. Without inclining to modesty, he wrote in the notes which accompanied the showing in 1931 of How He Lied to Her Husband, the first full-length talkie for which he supplied the script, that "like all playwrights, I have had many proposals from the great film corporations for the screening of my plays, some of them tempting enough commercially." He went on to maintain that in the days of the silent films, films he designated as "movies," he had reason to decline the lucrative proposals on what he saw as aesthetic grounds: "my plays were made to be spoken and could be of no use as silent plays, no matter how ingeniously they were patched by scraps of printed dialogue thrown on the screen as 'subtitles.' When the talkies arrived the situation changed. It became possible for the screen not only to show my plays, but to speak them."[59]

For Shaw too, then, the cinema was simply an extension of earlier literary forms. He seemed unaware of the ability of the camera to create an independent visual language and even less aware of the power of the film itself to influence the forms with which he was familiar. Continuing his comments, he wrote: "My plays do not consist of occasional remarks to illustrate pictures, but of verbal fencing matches between protagonists and antagonists, whose thrusts and ripostes, parries and passados, follow one another much more closely than thunder follows lightning. The first rule for their [film] producers is that there must never be a moment of silence from the rise of the curtain to its fall."[60] Shaw noted proudly among his "points for connoisseurs" of film that in *How He Lied to Her Husband*, except during a moment of dramatically functional silence, "the dialogue is continuous from end to end."[61] Shaw's dream of an "Oscar

Wilde of the movies who will flash epigraph after epigraph at the spectators"[62] paralleled Barrie's anticipation of and Wells's approach to the cinema.

* * *

W. L. George, the novelist and literary critic, in an article, "A Painter's Literature," which he wrote in 1920, provided an interesting distinction between the writers whom he called the "Neo-Victorians" (Galsworthy, Bennett, Wells)[63] and those whom he called the "Neo-Georgians" (Joyce, Lewis, Woolf, Richardson).[64] In so doing George unintentionally but tellingly reflected the feeling that literature could in no way be influenced by the presence of film. The momentum of tradition which prevented writers like Bennett, Wells, and Shaw from seeing what writers could learn from the techniques of film also prevented George from identifying the source of much contemporary experimentation in the novel.

Indeed, George expressed anxiety about the "Neo-Georgians" whose works, he said, demonstrated that intellectual statement, social comment, and moral criticism were being eclipsed by preoccupations with aesthetic virtuosity. In particular, George derided the "Neo-Georgians" for opening themselves to a stylistic eclecticism which admitted a strong pictorial influence "unsuited to literature."[65] Literature, George contended, should "narrate" and not, like painting, "depict."[66] He called the "Neo-Georgians" the "slaves of impression." Their work, he said, "seems to rest on that alone, and to amount to impression without conception. They make pictures of states of mind, and, by giving all the details of these states of mind, they end by imparting to all impressions the same value. (They will say that this is their object, because the eye, unlike the brain, is not a judge; thus they define their divorce from pure literature.)"[67] In the closing paragraph of his essay, George concluded with the comment that mere "pictures" of current social change, for example, could hardly interpret the meaning of the present and show man the way into the future; indeed, he said, "a picture of the social revolution 'written through the consciousness,' or wholly seen from the terrace of a café, . . . would compare ill with the product of a cinema camera man."[68]

George's essay, with its strongly delineated categories, raises at least indirectly a number of interesting questions. Most significant, perhaps, is the question of why George scrupulously avoided any exploration of a conjectured but for him entirely hypothetical comparison between the film and the novel. He raised the question again the following year. Again he despaired of the novelists who he felt had forsaken the "critical tradition" of the novel which, he claimed in his article, had been sustained by Hardy, Galsworthy, and Wells, novelists who willingly criticized the conditions of life in their time.

During the past ten years, he said, many novelists had "attempted to confine the novel to impressions of sense-pictures which the paint-pot and the film produce better."[69] The suggested comparisons between the novelist and the "cinema camera man" or the novel and the film ironically suggest critical implications which George did not intend. Perhaps the fact that George did not suggest any actual influence of the cinema on the novelists, and that he did not include cinema among the interests of "the new generation" which, he said, "tends to form composite cliques, where literature and dancing, sculpture and music, convince each other that they are expressing the same thing through a variety of media,"[70] suggests that any conscious interest of novelists in the cinema must have been quite imperceptible to the onlooker, and not widespread. Or perhaps George's statements simply reflected what in 1920 was the general attitude of writers and critics toward the actual influence of the cinema: unintentional or deliberate neglect.

D. THE MEANINGS OF THE CINEMA (2): THE CENTRAL PERSPECTIVE OF MODERN NOVELISTS AND DIVERS LIKE-MINDED CONTEMPORARIES AND CRITICS

> THERE EXISTS TODAY A CURIOUS MISCONCEPTION AS TO THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF MOTION PICTURES. WE ACCEPT THEM UNTHINKINGLY AS OBJECTIVE TRANSCRIPTS OF LIFE, WHEREAS IN REALITY THEY ARE SUBJECTIVE IMAGES OF LIFE. . . . MOTION PICTURES ARE OUR THOUGHTS MADE VISIBLE AND AUDIBLE. THEY FLOW IN A SWIFT SUCCESSION OF IMAGES, PRECISELY AS OUR THOUGHTS DO, AND THEIR SPEED, WITH THEIR FLASHBACKS--LIKE SUDDEN UPRUSHES OF MEMORY--AND THEIR ABRUPT TRANSITIONS FROM ONE SUBJECT TO ANOTHER, APPROXIMATES VERY CLOSELY THE SPEED OF OUR THINKING. THEY HAVE THE RHYTHM OF THE THOUGHT-STREAM AND THE SAME UNCANNY ABILITY TO MOVE FORWARD OR BACKWARD IN SPACE OR TIME, UNHAMPERED BY THE RATIONALIZATIONS OF THE CONSCIOUS MIND. (R. E. Jones, 1941)[71]

Virginia Woolf was not the only writer to relate, by implication at least, the stream-of-consciousness novel with the "dream architecture" of the film--and both with the transcript of "subjective reality." Both Dorothy Richardson and Wyndham Lewis did, with surprisingly different results. Film makers, too, including Eisenstein, the philosopher, Susanne Langer, the literary critics, Irving Deer, Joseph Warren Beach, Robert Humphrey, Harry Levin, Roger Shattuck, and others, and novelists such as Malcolm Lowry and Alain Robbe-Grillet have all tended to see in the film medium a model for the portrayal of private perception, the rhythm of the thought-stream, or as Lewis more caustically called it at its most elementary level, "the dramatic scum" which "oozes and accumulates into the characters we see."[72]

It is often tempting to assume that film, composed as it is of actual visual images which are the projected photographs of external reality, is inherently a relatively "objective" form of expression. In their book, The Cinema as Art, Ralph Stephenson and J. R. Debrix, for example, have stated that "the photographic image created by a mechanical process is more objective than other artistic methods of reproduction."[73] Similarly, Edward Murray, in The Cinematic Imagination, has taken for granted that what he has called "machine-like objectivity"[74] is one of the primary properties of film. These writers have linked objectivity to mechanism.

Wyndham Lewis has provided the corrective to this line of thinking by insisting that the camera, which he saw as the epitome of the machine, gives a highly specialized and hardly "objective" rendering of reality. As Lewis frequently pointed out, any eye (for example, the camera's as well as the spectator's) operating in isolation from the modifying effects of the other senses increasingly distorts reality. Since "the eye, and its habits," Lewis wrote, "has a great effect upon the psyche closeted at the back of the eye,"[75] the film as medium is uniquely competent to deal with the subjective side of reality, for its effects are primarily on the eye. Robert Gessner in his book, The Moving Image (1968), has summarized correctly: "the exciting plastic surface makes objectivity difficult, since cinema in its movements and lights, its sense of presence and immediacy, is similar to a dream experience or a stream-of-consciousness."[76]

Film-makers, sensitive to the natural propensity of film to be an essentially distorting medium, deliberately turned to the subjective function of the camera with varying degrees of aesthetic intention and success. George Méliès, whose interest in the cinema in the 1890's evolved from his work as a magician, exploited fully the film's inherent potential for transforming the apparantly stable spatial and temporal aspects of the universe into fantastic, science-fiction representations. Two or three decades later the Expressionists, who in their art emphasized the use of objects of the external world for transmitting the nature of inner experience, and the Surrealists, who stressed the logic of dream in their work, saw in film a ready vehicle for their own aesthetic concerns. However, it might be claimed that in films such as Wiene's Expressionistic The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (1919), and Buñuel and Dali's Surrealistic Un chien andalou (1928), for example, the techniques and content, self-consciously drawing attention to the theme of inner subjectivity, tend, by stressing what is already inherent in the medium in any case, to parody the medium in which they are operating. Similarly, the traditional film-usage of stock visual or sound devices which serve as sign-posts separating fantasies, dreams, or memories from the film's narrative line involves the artificial use of paraphernalia which are in one sense entirely redundant or self-mocking in terms of the medium.

In "A Note on Film," contained in a brief appendix at the end of her study of art, Feeling and Form, Susanne Langer, having recognized the subjective aspect of film--of film tending toward "pure thought, pure dream, pure inner life"[77]--as its basic characteristic, has linked the nature of the film-medium and the structure of the film-form with that of dreams. Film, with its freedom from the restrictions of a fixed, continuous space and time, and with its perpetual presentness--its "endless Now"[78]--partakes, she wrote, of the conventions of the dream mode: "I do not mean that it copies dream, or puts one into a daydream. Not at all. . . . Cinema is 'like' dream in the mode of its presentation: it creates a virtual present, an order of direct apparition. That is the mode of dream."[79] Having referred to Eisenstein's discussions of the influence of montage on the spectator, Langer saw the spectator of film as a subjective participant in the personal re-creation of a dream-world. Film, she said, "seems one's own creation, direct visionary experience, a 'dreamt reality.'"[80]

In contrasting the novel and the drama in terms of their respective relations to the film, Langer stated that it is the novel which potentially offers the aesthetic peculiarities which might most readily parallel those of the film, especially the film's penchant for, as Dorothy Richardson once put it, "making game of time and space."[81] A story narrated, Langer wrote, "does not require as much 'breaking down' to become screen apparition, because it has no framework itself of fixed space, as the stage has; and one of the aesthetic peculiarities of dream, which the moving picture takes over, is the nature of its space. Dream events are spatial . . . but they are not oriented in any total space. The same is true of the moving picture: . . . its space come and goes."[82]

Literary critics, too, have seen in film structure a number of devices which help to define the modern novelists' narrative techniques and their preference for subjective and flowing thought patterns rather than for a stable authorial point of view. A statement by Irving Deer, although it does not speak to the issue involving English stream-of-consciousness novelists, nevertheless gives an indication of the kind of sensitivity to be found in the thinking of a few other critics as well. In a recent article (1972), Deer suggested that one can see "in the work of Strindberg, Dostoevsky and Kafka, among that of many other writers, expressionistic, psychological and dream techniques strangely akin to the film in the fluidity they suggest about human experience, a fluidity expressive of particularly modern ideas about the dissolution of character, the possible distortions and interdependence of time and space, the strange intermingling of illusion and reality, and the breakdown of any fixed moral or spatial reference points."[83]

Four decades earlier Joseph Warren Beach, referring in particular to Conrad, James, and Pirandello in his work, The Twentieth-Century Novel (1932), discussed in terms of cinema writers' dwelling on the minute aspects of their characters' subjective predicaments. Time and space are infinitely expanded to create what he termed the "subjective close-up"[84] commonly found in modern novels. "Wonderful combinations of close-up and ralenti are found," he wrote by way of comparison, "in the masterpieces of Charlie Chaplin and Emil Jannings."[85] Discussing also the prevalence of the fantasy or day-dream in the stream-of-consciousness novel and the manipulation of the order of time and space Beach again turned to the cinema: "[an] enlightening analogy is perhaps that of the moving picture, especially the sort cultivated in Germany, France, and Russia, with its generous use of cut-back, of symbolic themes, of dissolving views, all meant to give the picture a wider and richer significance than that of a mere story told in chronological sequence."[86] He added: "It is probable that the moving picture has had a very strong influence on the stream-of-consciousness technique."[87] He suggested that where the stream-of-consciousness technique can be said to fail in the novel, the valuation will be that it is "not practicable for word-pictures, however practicable it may be for pictures taken on a photographic plate."[88]

Robert Humphrey, in his book, Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel (1954), like Beach linked the stream-of-consciousness novel with the dream-like aspects of the cinema. Concentrating particularly on the work of James Joyce and Virginia Woolf, Humphrey saw in their use of what he called time-montage and space-montage the basis of his analogy between novel and film. "The chief function of all of the cinematic devices, particularly of the basic one of montage, is to express movement and coexistence," he wrote. "It is this ready-made device for representing the nonstatic and the nonfocused which the stream-of-consciousness writers have grasped."[89]

Perhaps largely because of Joyce's prominence among modern writers, most critical acknowledgement of the importance of the development of cinema for contemporary novelists has concerned itself with his work. Harry Levin, for example, writing of Ulysses in 1941, drew attention to a comparison which Wyndham Lewis had made fifteen years earlier. Levin suggested that "Bloom's mind is . . . a motion picture, which has been ingeniously cut and carefully edited to emphasize the close-ups and fade-outs of flickering emotion, the angles of observation and the flashbacks of reminiscence. In its intimacy and in its continuity, Ulysses has more in common with the cinema than with other fiction. The movement of Joyce's style, the thought of his characters, is like unreeling film; his method of construction, the arrangement of this raw material, involved the crucial operation of montage."[90]

Eisenstein, who spoke extravagantly of the potential in film for reconstructing "all phases and all specifics of the course of thought,"[91] gave an incisive assessment of the kinship between film and the work of Joyce. Emphasizing Joyce's use of "interior monologue," Eisenstein selected Ulysses and Finnegans Wake as representative of a mode of literature which most closely approximates the cinema's ability--as he ideally envisioned it--to provide a totality of the inner experience of man:

> Here was reached the limit in reconstructing the reflection and refraction of reality in the consciousness and feelings of man.
>
> Joyce's originality is expressed in his attempt to solve this task with a special dual-level method of writing: unfolding the display of events simultaneously with the particular manner in which these events pass through the consciousness and feelings, the associations and emotions of one of his chief characters. Here literature, as nowhere else, achieves an almost physiological palpability. To the whole arsenal of literary methods of influence has been added a compositional structure that I would call "ultra-lyrical." For while the lyric, equally with the imagery, reconstructs the most intimate passage of the inner logic of feeling, Joyce patterns it on the physiological organization of the emotions, as well as on the embryology of the formation of thought.[92]

Joyce himself saw the relationship between the articulation of modes of consciousness in his own work and that of film. Eisenstein has indicated that when he met Joyce in Paris, Joyce "was intensely interested in [his] plans for the inner film-monologue. . . . Despite his almost total blindness, Joyce wished to see those parts of Potemkin and October that . . . move along kindred lines."[93]

Malcolm Lowry, writing mainly in the 1940's during a period when he viewed the stream-of-consciousness experimentation as a major achievement characteristic of an earlier generation of writers, substantiates in his criticism and fiction the appropriateness of linking the subjective aspects of the film and the subjectivist tendencies of the novel. Lowry's Under the Volcano (1947), a novel which critics often take to be modelled on Joyce's Ulysses, is the portrayal of three characters whose tormented souls are described in terms of subjective, often surrealistic, perceptions of fragmented, personal worlds. Lowry's use of film-like techniques and forms in a novel in which the characters verge constantly toward the abyss of inner hell brings to mind a statement of Eisenstein's in which he spoke of the ability of film and of literature to treat highly abnormal views of reality. "Only the film-element commands a means for an adequate presentation of the whole course of thought through a disturbed mind," he claimed. "Or, if literature can do it, it is only a literature that breaks through the limits of its orthodox enclosure."[94] The worlds of inner agony, revealed in Chapters II-XII of Under the Volcano, are film-like, Lowry once suggested in a statement referring to the minor character, the Frenchman M. Laruelle, whose film-making interests are introduced in Chapter I of the novel: "if you look closely you could see that the whole book could be taken to be M. Laruelle's film--if so, it was my way of paying devout tribute to the French film."[95] Lowry wrote elsewhere of Under the Volcano: "It can be regarded . . . as something like a cowboy film . . . a crazy film."[96]

In the novel itself, Yvonne Constable's nightmare-like fear of being always pursued through the dark streets of New York provides a succinct illustration of Lowry's overall method. Subjective fears, in a more self-consciously literal manner than is generally the case in Under the Volcano, intermingle with the shots of a film. Coming out of the black but neon-lit streets haunted by men who seem to her to have lost all hope in life, Yvonne enters a cinema: "'Yvonne, Yvonne!' a voice was saying at her entrance, and a shadowy horse, gigantic, filling the whole screen, seemed leaping out of it at her: . . . [it was] as if she had walked straight out of that world outside into this dark world on the screen, without taking breath."[97]

In some of his novels Lowry's characters consciously feel or articulate their awareness of the appropriateness of the analogy between film techniques and the movements of inner life. Indeed, they often regard the film as an extension of that reality. In October Ferry to Gabriola, for example, Ethan Llewelyn, haunted by his own sense of guilt, goes to the local cinema to see The Wandering Jew, a movie about the fugitive who roves about the world as he bears the curse of God. Old, irrational fears that he himself is a type of the Wandering Jew suddenly expand when he senses that the movie is providing a continuity for the feelings of his own soul: "'Subjectively' . . . Ethan wondered if this wasn't an almost universal experience, when life was going desperately, and you dropped into some lousy movie to get away for an hour from yourself, only to discover that, lo and behold, this movie might as well have been a sort of symbolic projection, a phantasmagoria, of that life of yours, into which you'd come halfway through."[98] It is, to use Eliot's phrase, "as if a magic lantern threw the nerves in patterns on a screen."[99]

For Lowry, stream-of-consciousness might more aptly be described as the downward plunge of consciousness, since many of his characters are trammeled by their own inner selves as they hasten toward what seems like inevitable destruction. Lowry found in the movie process itself a metaphor--based on the reel, or wheel of time, turning relentlessly--which best interprets the sense of unavoidable annihilation. For example, in thinking of the movie, The Wandering Jew, Ethan contemplates its hero, "going to his predetermined ruin. . . . [A]gainst such a predetermined doom, as against one's fate in the nightmare, finally you rebel! How? when the film will always end in the same way anyhow?"[100] Deeply spiritual agonies also lead the hero of Dark As the Grave Wherein My Friend Is Laid to equate his inner life with the life and mechanical movement of films. Sigbjørn Wilderness desperately asks of himself: "Was he the director of this film of his life? Was God? Was the devil? He was an actor in it, but if God were the director that was no reason why he should not constantly appeal to Him to change the ending."[101]

In the text of Lowry's still unpublished film version of F. Scott Fitzgerald's Tender is the Night, he again identified and emphasized those qualities which relate film to the wide range of uncontrolled, subjective responses within any individual. While explaining his surrealistic and potentially quite literary use of written word-symbols--"signs, words, advertisements"[102]--which were to flash erratically across the movie screen, he made a note in the script:

> While all this is passing at such great speed it does not have time to sink into our minds, in fact some of these things may be only half seen, nonetheless it all contributes to what one might call the subconscious life of the movie itself, thereby rendering it the more dramatic. More than that, such attention to detail, philosophically speaking, gives the film a sort of solipsistic world of its own which, if expressed in accordance with strict realism that in turn is in accordance with the actual historical facts, will inevitably increase our response to it by appealing to facets of the consciousness not usually called into play. . . . Many emotions may be evoked in the spectators without their being aware of how, or without, even, being consciously aware that they are being so evoked, which all add up to the impact and final impression.[103]

Like Lowry, Alain Robbe-Grillet, novelist and now film-maker,[104] has been oriented, in his discussions of the French New Novel, toward an identification of film with intensely subjective experience. In his explanation of the continued use of a distinct cinema-mode in the writing of the New Novelists, he has stated that it is not the reputed objectivity of the camera, but its access to rendering life by means of a highly specialized perspective, which has determined the writers' choice of techniques: "It is not the camera's objectivity which interests [many of the new novelists], but its possibilities in the realm of the subjective, of the imaginary. . . . [Their interest is] in the image as in the sound, the possibility of presenting with all the appearance of incontestable objectivity what is, also, only dream or memory--in a word, what is only imagination."[105] A world unfolding according to conventions which highlight the subjective aspect of a character's life is, Robbe-Grillet has indicated, the artist's compliment to the reader/spectator, for it is an invitation for the reader/spectator to participate creatively in giving meaning and order to the world of dream: "far from neglecting him, the author today proclaims his absolute need of the reader's cooperation, an active, conscious, creative assistance. What he asks of him is no longer to receive ready-made a world completed, full, closed upon itself, but on the contrary to participate in a creation."[106]

Accepting the technique of juxtaposition as central to the methods of the modernists, Roger Shattuck, in The Banquet Years (1955) has summarized the rationale behind such writers' use of a verbally alogical structuring of the elements of their art, and has stressed the importance of the cinema as the primary model for the modernists' tendency:

> At last an answer begins to emerge to the question of why the seemingly rough and arbitrary technique of juxtaposition has shaped so many modern works, why it is art at all. The intimacy of the voyeur relationship to art, watching it from the wings, represents a yearning to be in touch with the subconscious world which produces it. This candidness is turned inward. Interest in the inaccessible resources of the human mind induced the arts to model themselves less and less on the rational polite disciplines of the past. They sought what Sergei Eisenstein called "inner speech." Subconscious thought processes--dream and memory and wit--function by sudden leaps the way a spark jumps a gap. The arts have sought to duplicate these inner creative processes, to portray them without putting them through rigorous realignments of dramatic development, linear perspective, or tonality. Self-reflexiveness aims a work of art at itself, at its own development, as both subject and form. Juxtaposition, with its surprises and intimacy of form, brings the spectator closer than ever before to the abruptness of creative process. The film, for example, an art of pure juxtaposition, conveys the restlessness of the mind in action.[107]

E. NOVEL AND FILM: THE NOVELIST'S PERSPECTIVE

> IN MODERN LITERATURE THERE IS PROBABLY NO MORE CELEBRATED TECHNIQUE THAN THAT OF THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS OR INTERIOR MONOLOGUE. . . . THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS IS REALLY MANAGED BY THE TRANSFER OF FILM TECHNIQUE TO THE PRINTED PAGE, WHERE, IN A DEEP SENSE IT REALLY ORIGINATED. (Marshall McLuhan, 1964)[108]

Recent interest in developing an aesthetic approach which deals with the relationship between novel and film has centred to some extent on the literary and film work of Alain Robbe-Grillet. The critic Bruce Morrissette, in an overview of the history, the current state, and the possible future of "a combined rhetoric of these two basic arts of fiction,"[109] has tried to show that, using the work of Robbe-Grillet as a kind of base, the comparativist may move toward the structuring of such a combined rhetoric. He has seen in the work of Robbe-Grillet--both the novels and the films--"an increasing interplay of technical innovations in the two genres."[110] Already in 1965 he contended that the art of Robbe-Grillet "may well serve as the basis for a 'unified field' theory of novel-film relationships in the future." He suggested that "the art of Robbe-Grillet, with its objectification of mental images, its use of psychic chronology, its development of 'objectal' sequences or series related formally and functionally to plot and to the implicit psychology of characters, its refusal to engage in logical discourse or analytical commentary, is as ideally suited to film as to narrative."[111]

Although Morrissette has placed undue stress on what he has considered to be the centrality of the role of Robbe-Grillet in this regard, his emphasis on approaching the comparative aesthetics of novel and film through the thinking of a single artist personally involved in both media is significant. It represents in principle the approach which is used in this study. This approach differs from that of the critics who ignore the novelist's own vision, or interpretation, or definition of the cinema. Such critics often tend to use a catalogue of criteria which may circumvent those perspectives only to be established by taking into account the novelist's own views.

It is appropriate that Morrissette has approached the question of influences and of comparative criticism cautiously. He has objected particularly to various critics' tendency to "minimize inherent specific differences"[112] by a literal identification of one medium with the other. Indeed, comparisons between the two arts, rooted in two such radically dissimilar media, print and visual images, work best analogically and not literally. The key points of the analogy--key, that is, from the perspective of the novelist in question--constitute one of the main areas of concern of this study. In the case of Lewis and Richardson, what were for each the central points of the analogy provide the meaning of the metaphor--the cinema taken as metaphor--as it was employed stylistically and thematically by each.

Both Lewis and Richardson were particularly sensitive to the new medium and to the possibilities for change in the form of the novel. Since their statements about cinema and their awareness of an analogical relationship between film and novel were intensified by their own aesthetic concerns, their work should be of interest to anyone occupied as Morrissette has been with "the increasing interplay of technical innovation in the two genres" and with the history of the development of a "unified field theory" for the two media. Wyndham Lewis, who experimented with both visual and verbal forms before the first World War, used cinema as a metaphor to explore his complex response to the increasingly self-conscious subjectivity of the modern novel. His development as an artist carried him from a spirited exploration of cinema-like techniques and structures in early works such as _The Enemy of the Stars_ and _Tarr_ to a rejection of such techniques in the novels of the late 1920's (_The Childermass_ and _The Apes of God_), which incorporate brilliant parodies of the stream-of-consciousness novel and satirical commentary on the effects of the new media on the individual and collective consciousness. Dorothy Richardson's life-long work of fiction, Pilgrimage, begun before the onset of the war, provides a sustained demonstration of aesthetic principles derived from her own view of the cinema.

PART TWO

DOROTHY RICHARDSON'S LITERARY EXPLORATIONS:

THE MIMING OF CINEMA

IF YOU ARE A NOVELIST AND WANT TO WATCH YOUR SCENE TAKING PLACE VISIBLY BEFORE YOU, IT IS SIMPLEST TO PROJECT IT ON TO AN IMAGINARY SCREEN. (Christopher Isherwood, 1947)[1]

THE OUTER SKIN OF THINGS, THE EPIDERMIS OF REALITY, THESE ARE THE RAW MATERIAL OF THE CINEMA. IN GLORIFYING THE MATERIAL IT REVEALS THE PROFOUND SPIRITUALITY OF MATTER AND ITS RELATION TO THE MIND OF MAN WHENCE IT IS DERIVED. (Antonin Artaud, 1930)[2]

A. DOROTHY RICHARDSON AND THE CINEMA: BIOGRAPHY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY IN BRIEF

> THE CINEMA, HAVING BEEN FIRST A NINE MONTHS WONDER AND THEN, ALMOST TO DATE, A PERENNIAL PERPLEXITY, MATTER FOR PUBLIC REPUDIATION MITIGATED BY PRIVATE AND, WITH FAIR GOOD FORTUNE, SECURELY INVISIBLE PATRONAGE, IS NOW PART OF OUR LIVES, RANKS, AS A TOPIC, ALONGSIDE THE THEATRE AND THERE ARE FILMS THAT MUST BE SEEN. WE GO. NO LONGER IN SECRET AND IN TAXIS AND ALONE, BUT OPENLY IN PARTIES IN THE CAR. (Dorothy Richardson, 1927)[3]

Dorothy Richardson's personal interest in the cinema found articulate critical expression during the years 1927 to 1933, when she revealed her attitude toward film in a long series of essays which appeared under the general heading, "Continuous Performance." The essays, numbering about twenty in all, appeared in Close Up,[4] a little magazine which Richardson described in 1951 as having been "the first to take cinema seriously."[5] In a statement she made in 1927--"We are for THE FILM as well as for FILMS"[6]--Richardson expressed the generally prevailing attitude she held toward the cinema in the days of the silent film. Her unequivocal admiration was modified with the coming of the talkie.

Richardson's strong attraction to the silent film predated her period as film essayist by many years. She recollected in 1928 what had been for her the wondrous sense of the much earlier impact of moving pictures as "those crudish, incessantly sparking, never-to-be-forgotten photographs, setting the world in movement before our enchanted eyes."[7] Her earliest attraction to the cinema lay not in its aesthetic achievement, of which there was at first little, but simply in the "miraculous" presence of objects in motion: "We were knocked silly by the new birth, were content to marvel at the miracle."[8]

By the 1920's, however, when aesthetic achievements of a number of film-makers had made the cinema a proper candidate for a place among the legitimate art forms, Richardson stated: "That babe is now a youth, a thing of beauty."[9] She felt the cinema would fulfill the hopes of those, like herself, who saw it as a medium for art. "So far," she wrote emphatically in 1927, "its short career of some twenty years is a tale of splendid achievement. Its creative power is incalculable."[10] She especially appreciated generally the German and Russian films, and pointed specifically to The Student of Prague, with Conrad Veidt, as a prime example of film as an art form.[11] Also, contemplating a potential list of the world's "Hundred Best Films" she suggested in 1929 that some of them "have already been made in pioneering Russia."[12]

Richardson claimed in 1928 that she had grown impatient with those critics whom she described as scorning "the cinema and all its works."[13] In an eloquent defence of the future of the cinema as an art form, she sarcastically attacked "the ravings of the ebullient critics" who, in her opinion, were motivated by a "desire to nip in the bud" what they saw as a "virulently poisonous growth."[14] The critics might have been suffering, Richardson surmised, from a paranoic "vision of the cinema as embarked upon an orgy of destruction that would demolish the theatre, leave literature bankrupt and the public taste hopelessly debauched."[15] She dismissed this vision by calling it "futility personified."[16]

In her pleas for a wide-spread acceptance of the cinema, Richardson distinguished what she called "the Films"--those which occupied a niche patronized by the peculiar mingling of people at that time known popularly as "highbrow"[17]--from what she referred to as "the Movies."[18] She wrote in 1928 that "roughly, there are the two main territories, the territory of the Films, and the territory of the Movies. The Films climb, austere and poverty-stricken while the Movies roll in wealth upon the lush floor of the valley."[19] Richardson chose to defend the "bad, beloved" but often very popular "Movies" against the attacks of the highbrows. She suggested that the attackers were too inflexible in their lack of empathy with audiences whose life-styles or education had produced an order of tastes different from theirs. There would always be a legitimate demand, she maintained, for an art which appealed to the "philistines," an art thriving on stock characters, formulaic conventions of plot, and happy endings.

When Richardson was asked, "[w]hat things do you really like?" in a questionnaire sent out by the editors of the Little Review in 1929, her reply included four times in one paragraph the words, "[t]he cinema."[20] In response to the same questionnaire she listed "Sound and Colour in cinema"[21] among her "dislikes." Richardson's preference for silent cinema--that is, for cinema in which the only sound was that of musical accompaniment--was intensified at times to religious devotion: "The film," she wrote, "is a spirit and they that worship it must worship it in spirit and in truth."[22]

Although Richardson at times expressed her delight in the new medium in most ecstatic terms, she also recognized some of its short-comings in comparison with literature. The mechanically-paced forward looping of the film, she observed, allowed the spectator "none of the go as you please that is one of the charms of reading, no pause for reflection, no turning back, no possibility of apprehension."[23] A spectator must "adjust [his] sensibilities to follow its pace and either keep them so adjusted or miss the whole, miss the closely-woven continuity that is the life of a good film."[24] Richardson summarized succinctly: "you cannot hold a film in your hand and study it at leisure."[25] Literature--its medium print, its format the book--remained always for Richardson the "intimate domestic friend, the golden lamp at the elbow."[26]

The arrival of the talkie brought into perspective for Richardson not only the question of an aesthetic which would deal with the talkie on the one hand, and the silent film and also the book on the other, but also the question of the future of the silent film and, notwithstanding her ridiculing of the "ebullient critics," the future of the book. She also wrote in 1929 that she was fearful that the silent feature film, which she affectionately called "the silent magic lantern,"[27] would be forced into extinction by commercial exploitation of the public's demand for novelty. As for the future of the novel, it seemed to Richardson that simple observation revealed that the film actually had expanded rather than diminished the market for readers. She claimed that "the film to date has reinforced the book by creating more readers than it has destroyed if indeed it has destroyed any. The two arts are visibly playing into each others hands."[28] Richardson felt sure that H. G. Wells, who, in his introduction to The King who was a King, spoke of "the film's power of excelling the written word," must have been overstating his case to find acceptance for a less extravagant point. She was certain that "it [was] hardly possible to suppose that Wells [saw] in the arrival of the film the departure of literature."[29]

Most radically and optimistically for her time, Richardson predicted in 1929 that the cinema would probably, as it progressed, "achieve for all the arts renaissance rather than death."[30] In particular she pointed out that "in literature alone it [was] creating a new form." She explained that "just as the stage play created a public for the written play and many are the unplayable plays that are eminently readable and quite numerous those who in any case would rather read a play than see it acted--so will the practice of film-seeing create a public for the film literature of which, if we except the miniature scenarios from time to time appearing in periodicals, Mr. Wells' own book is characteristically enough, the first example."[31] Richardson, acknowledging that "there are plenty of people who believe that what is an artistic success in one medium cannot be born alive in another," always maintained that "there are, fortunately for those who enjoy experimenting in more than one medium, plenty who do not."[32] Her own novel, Pilgrimage, is a major exercise in the literary mimicry of film.

* * *

A small number of literary critics and reviewers, writing at an early point in the publication of Richardson's series of fictional volumes--writing prior, that is, to the appearance of Oberland (1927) and to Richardson's first essay on film (1927) in Close Up--

suggested indirectly or tried to show, at times derisively, that Richardson's fiction had something in common with the film. It was, for example, the current of literary critics' grudging prejudice against the cinema which provided both an anonymous reviewer and the critic, John Middleton Murry, with adequate means for derogating the novel. Pilgrimage, they wrote in 1920 and 1922 respectively, was "merely an endless film,"[33] as "tiring as a twenty-four-hour cinematograph without interval or plot."[34] The prevailing opinion that cinema was the formless product of a necessarily uncreative recording machine again provided the basis for a description of Pilgrimage in 1924: "The succession is that of the episodes in a cinematograph film with a tenuous plot. . . . [T]he author continues to turn the handle steadily, and everything . . . is reproduced with equal fidelity."[35]

Other early critics, more sympathetic to cinema, drew on their interest in the new medium in their discussions of Pilgrimage. Alluding particularly to the cinema's tendency to create temporal and spatial discontinuities in narrative structure, one reviewer in 1921 wrote of "Miss Richardson's photographing of the actions and interactions of unusual mental states with exceedingly commonplace outward events," and of "the bewildering cinema-like habits her photographs have of 'fading out' into a set of dots across the page and turning into something quite different."[36] In 1919, while describing what he referred to as the "kaleidoscopic speed" of Miriam's changing moods, another reviewer suggested that reading Pilgrimage was "like watching a cinema show."[37] And in 1923 the first six volumes of Pilgrimage were described by still another critic as Richardson's presentation of "a cinema of her mind."[38]

Critics who wrote after 1927 referred more deliberately to the evident parallels between Pilgrimage and the film medium. E. M. Maisel stated in 1939 that a "careful investigation of such factors as . . . the advent of cinema . . . would undoubtedly point to a stage in which [Richardson's] style was ripe for discovery."[39] Edward Wagenknecht, noting that in reading Pilgrimage "we see the world, and we see other persons, only as they impinge upon [Miriam's] consciousness," concluded in his discussion of Pilgrimage in 1943: "Sometimes the vividness which results is essentially cinematic."[40] In 1956 Leon Edel, discussing narrative point-of-view in Pilgrimage, and noting the influence of Henry James, "the master," directed attention to the deliberateness of Richardson's choice of what he called "camera eye" technique:

> The fascination of putting the reader into a given angle of vision and keeping him there--this was the lesson of the Master for Miss Richardson and she learnt it well; it became the guiding light by which she worked:
>
> "The train was high above the platform. Politely smiling, Miriam scrambled to the window. The platform was moving, the large bright station moving away. Fraulein's wide smile was creasing and caverning under her hat from which the veil was thrown back . . . Fraulein's form flowed slowly

> away with the platform."
>
> To-day we would call this the "camera eye" so accustomed are we to seeing it done in the cinema. Miss Richardson anticipated the moving picture camera; from the first she brought everything into the orbit of Miriam's eyes and her senses. . . .[41]

Finally, in 1963 Gloria Glikin wrote that Richardson's "attraction to the cinema is apparent in Oberland, the most pictorial of her volumes and the one in which she displayed her clear grasp of cinematic techniques."[42]

As I examine Pilgrimage, I shall pay special attention to Oberland, which appeared at a time not only when Richardson was turning to the writing of essays on the film, but also at the time when the silent cinema was well established. Although Oberland has been singled out as a volume showing most graphically and in a most sustained way the influence of the cinema upon Richardson's imagination, Pointed Roofs, the first novel of Pilgrimage, begun in 1913[43] and published in 1915, already provides evidence of Richardson's overall approach to her fiction by what may be referred to as cinematic technique. With the hope of enlarging the views of critics who have seen, in terms of their own definitions of the cinema, evidence of the influence of cinema in Richardson's stream-of-consciousness novel, I intend now to examine first Richardson's personal views about film as a medium and her interpretation of the medium itself, and then to view Pilgrimage in the light of Richardson's own aesthetic/philosophical definitions of film and of the film-viewing experience.

B. RICHARDSON'S AESTHETIC (1): THE CINEMA AND THE SPECTATOR

> THE EXPLORATION OF THE CINEMATIC WORLD IS FRAUGHT WITH EVEN GREATER CONSEQUENCES THAN THE EXPLORATION OF THE PHYSICAL WORLD. . . . IN THE DEPTHS OF MATTER LIE INCALCULABLE AIRY REALMS UNSUSPECTED BY THE DEVOTEES OF THE SPIRIT WORLD. SO TOO, IN THIS WORLD WHICH WITH OUR WAKING EYES WE RIGIDLY TAKE FOR GRANTED, FROM THE MOST DEMONIC TO THE SUBLIME, WHICH ONLY THE PLAY OF FANTASY CAN BRING TO LIGHT. (Henry Miller, 1947)[44]

Art, said Dorothy Richardson, invites the spectator to participate in what she considered to be the essential element of all experience--"creative collaboration" between the individual and the work of art, or between the individual and the environment. In 1934, having been asked in a questionnaire her opinions about the contemporary social "relevance" of art, Richardson responded in terms which encompassed but also superseded the scope of the question: "the relevance of 'art,' of all kinds and on all levels, to 'existing conditions,' at all times and in all places," she said, "resides in its power to create, or arouse, or call into operation (but not to direct--that is the business of ethics) the human faculty of contemplation. In other words: while subject to the influence of a work of art, we are ourselves artists, supplying creative collaboration in the form of a reaction of the totality of our creative and constructive and disinterested being."[45] This response by Richardson is a succinct summary of what remained throughout her career her central position on the significance of art.

At various times Richardson discussed the narrative arts, literature as well as film, in terms of their relation to her views on the collaborative function of art. For example, in a discussion of the novel, during which she was countering certain implications of the label, "stream of consciousness," by claiming that it was a spurious term, she posited the fact that literature, which links the consciousness of reader and writer, is the product of a "stable human consciousness."[46] She explained that this human consciousness, while it expands "from birth to maturity," nevertheless "sits stiller than a tree" and remains "one with itself thruout [sic] life."[47] She continued rhetorically: "Does not the power and charm of all literature reside in its ability to rouse and to concentrate the reader's contemplative consciousness?"[48] Further on in the same discussion, after having categorized and summarized the styles of novelistic writing, she concluded: "whatever be the means by which the reader's collaboration is secured, a literary work, for reader and writer alike, remains essentially an adventure of the stable contemplative human consciousness."[49]

Notwithstanding Richardson's grand inclusion of all literature, indeed of all art, under terms of reference which stress collaborative functioning, she did reserve for herself the right to point to certain modes of expression which, within a given art form, modified--either through enhancement or detraction from--what she considered to be the central role of art. Thus, in her discussions of the various narrative styles which novelists might choose to use, she at times broadly distinguished between two modes of expression. She developed the point of her distinction around the question of whether or not a particular style led to the novel's being what she called a "conducted tour"[50] for the reader, the term she used as a metaphor for the novel in which the author was "deliberately present telling his tale." In speaking of her own work, she explained her rejection of the model provided by the "conducted tour:"

> The material that moved me to write would not fit the framework of any novel I had experienced. I believed myself to be, even when most enchanted, intolerant of the romantic and realist novel alike. Each, so it seemed to me, left out certain essentials and dramatised life misleadingly. Horizontally. Assembling their characters, the novelists developed situations, devised events, climax and conclusion. I could not accept their finalities. Always, for charm or repulsion, for good or ill, one was aware of the author and applauding, or deploring, his manipulations. This, when the drama was a conducted tour with the author deliberately present telling his tale.[51]

Richardson acknowledged that it was Henry James who, keeping the reader "incessantly watching the conflict of human forces through the eye of a single observer,"[52] had exerted a considerable technical influence upon her own work. He had refrained, she wrote, from taking the reader "upon a tour amongst the properties, or breaking in with descriptive introductions of the players."[53]

In the article cited above, in which Richardson described the collaborative function of literature, she also specified the mode of writing which for her provided an alternative to the "conducted tour." The cinema was the model for this alternative mode. Noting again that "the process may go forward in the form of a conducted tour, the author leading, visible and audible, all the time," she added: "Or the material to be contemplated may be thrown on the screen, the author out of sight and hearing."[54] The cinema, specifically the silent cinema, provided Richardson with the model not only for the technique which she preferred and practised in the novel, but also, as I shall point out, for the power of any medium to bring a spectator to perfect contemplation without the interfering commentary of a conductor.

* * *

Richardson's description of the novel as "material . . . thrown on the screen" raises the question of what Richardson's views of film material might have been. Most important for Richardson was her conviction that the film ideally had an "unrivalled opportunity of presenting the life of the spirit directly" by utilizing "only the minimum of informative accompaniment."[55] The cinema, with its use of moving, visual images, provided Richardson with the rudimentary means of describing graphically and operationally the collaborative relationship between an individual and a work of art or between an individual and his actual environment. In the movie theatre the spectator, perceiving directly a visible environment in motion, sits "stiller than a tree:" "in any film of any kind those elements which in life we see only in fragments as we move amongst them, are seen in full in their own moving reality of which the spectator is the motionless, observing centre."[56]

"Deliberate, concentrated contemplation"[57] extending from the individual's consciousness, Richardson said in her writing on the novel, assists in the collaboration between an individual and a work of art. Cinema, Richardson saw, provides the circumstances which are perfectly suited to such contemplation. In 1931 she wrote in Close Up: "every imaginable kind of film, talkies included, . . . reduces or raises, as you please, the onlooker to a varying intensity of contemplation. . . . [W]hatever the ostensible interest of the film, it is arranged and focussed at the distance exactly fitting the contemplative state. . . . In this single, simple factor rests the whole power of the film: the reduction, or elevation of the observer to the condition that is essential to perfect contemplation."[58] It should be noted that Richardson's explicit inclusion here of the talkie was, for her, a magnanimous but momentary gesture arising mostly out of her general good feelings about the cinema and partially out of her largely unfulfilled hopes for the future of the talkie. Certainly it was the silent film which for Richardson best fulfilled what she saw as the role of art.

Richardson expressed her feeling, too, that the power of the silent film "to compel the co-operation of the creative consciousness of the audience"[59] is complemented by the accompaniment of continuous, unobtrusive music: "accompanying music is not an alien sound," she wrote. "It assists the plunge into life that just any film can give. . . . The music is not an alien sound if it be as continuous as the performance and blending with it. . . . Music is essential. Without it the film is a moving photograph and the audience mere onlookers. Without music there is neither light nor colour, and the test of this is that one remembers musically accompanied films in colour and those unaccompanied by music as colourless."[60] Because it was so important to her that the spectator should be able to "create the film," to "manufacture [his] own reality," Richardson at one point insisted that "dramatic action in photograph [unaccompanied by music] is obscene because it makes no personal demand upon the onlooker."[61]

Richardson's view of film as the ideal model for her own novelistic techniques did not prevent her from seeing in the film's use of the caption and of realistic, synchronized sound the potential for certain weaknesses, weaknesses which she was also able to relate to ones in the novel, specifically to the narrative mode in the novel which she found undesirable. She maintained, for example, that "if the direct giving of information in captions is the mark of a weak film, the direct giving of information in a . . . novel is the mark of a weak novel."[62] Her view of the use of the synchronized, talking voice paralleled her view of the use of captions: "Why do we hesitate [in abandoning the silent screen in favour of sound]?" she asked. "Is it that the interference between seer and seen is to be too complete? . . . The onlooker too overwhelmingly conducted?"[63]

When the talkie first arrived, Richardson felt that the term "film" could be applied legitimately only to silent film. It was the visual directness and immediacy of the film which she feared would be annihilated by the introduction of sound. Even while she was "merely imagining a film breaking into speech, wrecking its medium, its perfection of direct communication,"[64] she dreaded with "woeful apprehensions" her first visit to the talkies. "Vocal sound, always a barrier to intimacy," she felt, "is destructive of the balance between what is seen and the silently perceiving, co-operating onlooker."[65] When she actually experienced her first talkie--one, to be sure, which was mechanically still far from perfect--her worst fears were confirmed, she said. "Annihilating speech," or the "funeral march of words," demanded such concentration, she claimed, that "all, cinematographically, is lost; for no gain."[66] The experience verified in her mind the opinion that "cinematography is a visual art reaching the mind through the eyes alone."[67] It was her strong feeling that concentration on hearing resulted in "the diminution of the faculty of seeing."[68] The talkie, she concluded, was only an "ambitious pudding of incompatible ingredients."[69]

The film's "essential character," Richardson said, "is pantomime, and anything and everything else incidentally. But primarily pantomime."[70] The use of the visual image by itself was, in her opinion, most conducive to the spectator's participation for there is, she said, "no limit to vision:"[71] "on the screen . . . sight alone is able to summon its companion faculties: given a sufficient degree of concentration on the part of the spectator, a sufficient rousing of his collaborative creative consciousness. And we believe that the silent film secures this collaboration to a higher degree than the speech-film just because it enhances the one faculty that is best able to summon all the others: the faculty of vision."[72]

Richardson also specified that if captions must be used in a film, they should remain unobtrusive: "the right caption at the right moment is invisible. It flows unnoticed into visual continuity."[73] Visual images without captions, she emphasized strongly, in themselves supplied a pictorial logic which was constituted of an "unlimited material upon which the imagination of the onlooker could get to work unhampered by the pressure of a controlling mind that is not his own mind."[74] She announced in 1927: "we are ready to try doing without [captions]. Now and again a film gathers us in without any clear hint beyond the title. This we love. We love the callenge. We are prepared to go without a hint even in the title. We are prepared for anything. We trust the pictures."[75] Spoken or written words in a film, Richardson said, "served only to blur what was already abundantly clear."[76] She added in support of her own approach to watching films, the approach her readers must take in coming to Pilgrimage, that "somewhere, if not in any given place then all over the picture, is a hint."[77] She concluded: "And the pull of the film is just here, in its unsupplemented directness, in the way it can secure collaboration. . . . A good picture will tell its own story."[78] Most importantly for Richardson, a good picture will, ultimately, lead the spectator beyond his sensual self to a collaborative apprehension of "the real."

C. RICHARDSON'S AESTHETIC (2): THE PILGRIMAGE AND LIFE'S CINEMATOGRAPHIC SHOW

THERE EXISTS A WORLD, CINEMATIC IN TEXTURE AND CONTOUR, AS MARVELOUS AND INEXHAUSTIBLE AS ANY KNOWN TO THE POET OR MYSTIC. IT IS A WORLD WHICH, ONCE DISCOVERED, WILL ALTER THE VERY ATMOSPHERE WE BREATHE. ITS CARDINAL ELEMENT IS FANTASY. IT MANIFESTS ITSELF WHENEVER THE IMAGINATION LIBERATES ITSELF FROM THE THRALLS OF THE INTELLECT. (Henry Miller, 1947)[79]

The overall title of Dorothy Richardson's novel sequence is Pilgrimage. The concept of pilgrimage--specifically as it takes shape in the pilgrimage of Miriam--lies at the thematic and structural centres of the novel. Miriam's pilgrimage in the novel is not a journey toward any clearly articulated goal, but a journey toward what is for her an assumed goal which only makes its presence felt by a series of ever-intensified intimations. Miriam's is a journey toward inner enlightenment, toward awareness of what constitutes her real self. It is a journey not marked out by the traditional landmarks and experiences found in the lives of other of literature's pilgrims, but by correlatives taken by Richardson from the cinema.

Miriam, at first intent upon setting up her own terms of reference for finding meaning in life, lives in desperate but false pursuit of herself and her own fulfillment. Again and again she goes through the motions of personal friendships with male companions, involvement in social causes, and commitment to various jobs. These motions, however, measure only the superficial phases of her pilgrimage. It is from behind the surfaces of these tentative phases of her life that the real goal, first only in part but finally in its fullness, makes itself known to her. Then her active pursuit of false goals is replaced by the calm acceptance which accompanies her recognition that for herself her own "being" is the ultimate reality.

When she establishes an orientation toward herself and toward a life in which she finds great inner satisfaction, Miriam discovers that her spirit is linked to the spirit of her youth and infancy. She recovers a child-like personal vision of reality, a direct, ever-astonished perception of reality, a reality more meaningful to her than that created by intellectual analyses, categorizations, and labels. In a statement published in 1933 Richardson described the essence of that for which Miriam finally realizes she is searching: "We all date our personal existence from our first conscious awareness of reality outside ourselves. And this awareness is direct and immediate, preceding instruction as to the nature of the realities by which we are surrounded. Instruction and experience can enrich and deepen but can never outdo or replace this first immediate awareness. It recurs, in different forms, thruout life."[80] The experience and growing awareness and maturing interpretations of the meaning of the moments of "that first direct knowledge"[81] delineate the structure of Miriam's pilgrimage.

The means--involving what might be called progressive revelation--by which Richardson has chosen to illuminate and to let the reader gauge the quality, while simultaneously experiencing the pattern, of Miriam's pilgrimage are remarkably evocative of her own definition of the experiences which a film viewer may undergo. Indeed, it is precisely during the most dramatic moments of her pilgrimage that Miriam is shown to be involved in a world which she experiences as though she were a Richardsonian film spectator, watching what might be Richardson's ideal film, and discovering reality in moments of collaboration with the visual environment.

* * *

A statement which Richardson made during the year prior to the publication of the first volume of _Pilgrimage_ points to her method of disclosing the highlights of Miriam's spiritual pilgrimage in terms reflecting her view of the collaborative possibilities between the spectator and the environment created by the film. Writing in 1914 in _The Quakers Past and Present_ Richardson spoke of an individual's "accustomed surroundings" as the "cinematograph show" of his external world. This description came in the context of her discussion of the levels and intensities by which different groups of people--first, "most of us;" secondly, the "artist;" finally, the "mystic"--respectively may transcend, or nearly transcend, the external and glimpse, just briefly, or perhaps even grasp fully, the "real." Richardson's descriptions of the ideal film viewing experience relate closely, as I shall indicate, to her descriptions of the mystic's apprehension of reality, an apprehension which Miriam herself comes to realize in Pilgrimage.

Some human experiences, like the following, are, Richardson maintained, more or less universal: "when in everyday life our attention is arrested by something standing out from the cinematograph show of our accustomed surroundings, we fix upon this one point, and everything else fades away to the 'margin' of consciousness. The 'thing' which has had the power of so arresting us, of making a breach in the normal, unnoticed rhythm of the senses, allows our 'real self'--our larger and deeper being, to which so many names have been given--to flow up and flood the whole field of the surface intelligence."[82] Richardson suggested that "typical instances of this phenomenon are . . . the effect upon the individual of beauty on all its levels."[83] Although for most individuals "the times of illumination are intermittent, fluctuating, imperfectly accountable, and uncontrollable,"[84] the artist can at least sustain a continuous relationship with the beauty he sees, and with the glory which he recreates for his fellow human beings: "The 'artist' lives to a greater or less degree in a perpetual state of illumination, in perpetual communication with his larger self. But he remains within the universe constructed for him by his senses, whose rhythm he never fully transcends. His thoughts are those which the veil of sense calls into being, and though that veil for him is woven far thinner above the mystery of life than it is for most of us, it is there."[85]

Great religious mystics, according to Richardson, "those in whom the sense of an ultimate and essential goodness, beauty, and truth, is the dominant characteristic,"[86] are individuals who, like the Quakers, find in silence the first step of their pilgrimage, of "breaking through the veil of sense" and "making a journey to the heart of reality."[87] By their "deliberate control of all external stimuli, a swimming, so to say, against the whole tide of the surface intelligence," she wrote, they intentionally "[set] forth to seek something already found--something whose presence is in some way independent of the normal thinking and acting creature, something which has already proclaimed itself in moments of heightened consciousness."[88]

Of moments in the viewing of films Richardson later wrote: "Life's 'great moments' are silent. Related to them, the soundful moments may be compared to the falling of the crest of a wave that has stood poised in light, transluscent, for its great moment before the crash and dispersal. To this peculiar intensity of being, to each man's individual intensity of being, the silent film, with musical accompaniment, can translate him."[89] Richardson's conception of the ideal film viewing situation has its parallel in her description of the preparations which the mystic must make as he seeks his goal: "Silence, bodily and mental, is necessarily the first step in this direction. There is no other way of entering upon the difficult enterprise of transcending the rhythms of sense, and this, and nothing else, has been invariably the first step taken by the mystic upon his pilgrimage."[90] In a later reference to the individual's deepest inner experience, Richardson again advanced her view that the silent film provided a means of offering what, in the case of the mystic, she had referred to as "a journey to the heart of reality." The silent film, she wrote, had the "quality of being nowhere and everywhere, nowhere in the sense of having more intention than direction and more purpose than plan, everywhere by reason of its power to evoke, suggest, reflect, express from within its moving parts and in their totality of movement, something of the changeless being at the heart of all becoming. . . . In its insistence on contemplation it provided a pathway to reality."[91]

Richardson's description of the mystic's pilgrimage, together with her descriptions of a film spectator in an ideal viewing situation, provides a context for understanding Miriam's pilgrimage. It is a context which Miriam herself comes to perceive as her own mystical being is realized in Pilgrimage. It is through written descriptions which evoke the cinema viewing experience that Richardson illuminates Miriam's mystical pilgrimage. It is also through techniques which attempt to create the literary equivalents of the cinema viewer's experience that Richardson invites the reader's collaborative participation in the pilgrimage.

In Pilgrimage it is through contact with visual experience that Miriam transcends the visual; and this transcendence is in turn revealed to the reader through Richardson's handling of visual imagery.

D. MODES OF SEEING (1): MASCULINE AND FEMININE PERCEPTION

> THIS IS THE ILLUSION THAT THE CAMERA CREATES: THAT IT IS PRESENT AT THE HAPPENING, RATHER THAN TELLING US ABOUT SOMETHING THAT HAS ALREADY HAPPENED. FILM, IN OTHER WORDS, DOES NOT EXPLAIN: IT SHOWS. AND THE MOMENT WE ARE SHOWN SOMETHING WE BEGIN TO SENSE THE MYSTERY OF IT. FOR WE MUST DISCOVER THE UNDERLYING MEANINGS FOR OURSELVES.
> (Evelyn T. Riesman, 1957)[92]

Two broadly-defined ways in which an observer actually perceives the physical world, or, to use Dorothy Richardson's terminology, in which an observer perceives the "cinematograph show" of life, constantly receive attention throughout _Pilgrimage_. Richardson categorized these modes of perceiving according to two principles of vision--the masculine and the feminine. She discussed these not only in the novel itself, but also in her film essays in _Close Up_. Although she applied the two terms to physical vision it was their extended applicability to mental and spiritual levels which was most important for her.

Richardson was unrelenting at times in her insistence on maintaining the simplistic consistency of the masculine-feminine dichotomy.[93] As a result she--or rather, in the novel, Miriam--was often lead into what appear to be alienating pre-judgments of her relationships particularly with men. Nevertheless the categories, however blunt they might be, provide the reader with a framework for understanding Miriam's pilgrimage, because the categories are deeply integrated into the spirit and purpose, the theme and techniques, of the novel. Indeed, the many references to the masculine and the feminine ways of seeing are related to Richardson's fictional treatment of her theory of collaboration. They provide illustrations of both the failures (through masculine perception, Richardson would say) and successes (through feminine perception) of an individual's communion with his environment. In general, even though it is Miriam who in Pilgrimage persists in castigating the male for his blindness, the masculine principle of vision should be seen as symbolizing the false pursuits of Miriam herself--those in which Miriam engages during her life and which distract her, at least temporarily, from her ultimate goal. The feminine principle of vision should be identified in the novel with her successful journey toward the "real."

* * *

Men, complains the narrator of Pilgrimage, rather than seeing the inner depth and stillness of life, see only the surface and the movement of things, because that is how they see themselves: "They only see the appearances of things, understanding nothing of their relationships."[94] Miriam's long, drawn-out relationship, including her love affair, with Hypo Wilson,[95] provides scope for commentary about man's mode of vision. On one occasion, as Miriam and her close friend Amabel plan to meet Hypo socially, Miriam warns Amabel about the kind of mind, the kind of eye(s)--"two vacuities"[96]--with which they will have to contend: "'the intelligent eye, blinkered in advance with unsound generalizations, . . . and the clumsy masculine machinery of observation, working in this case like a hidden camera with a very visible and very gleaming lens, will both find themselves at fault.'"[97] The chapter which begins on the page in Pilgrimage following Miriam's statement and in which the anticipated meeting between Hypo and the two women is actually held, opens with words which emerge as a little joke, a knowing irony, shared between Richardson and the reader, and perhaps between Miriam and Amabel: "'I see. . . .'"[98] begins Hypo.

The image of the eye as a camera lens betraying thoughts that in the male simply cannot be camouflaged leads, on another occasion, to Miriam's anger with another suitor, Michael Shatov. Miriam on this occasion is watching Michael's quick glance at a group of people beside whom she and he are being seated in a restaurant: "the moment of catching, as they sat down, the flicker of his mobile eyelid, the lively unveiled recognizing glance he had flung at the opposite table, describing its occupants before she saw them; the rush of angry sympathy; a longing to blind him; in some way to screen them from the intelligent unseeing glance of all the men in the world.

'You don't see them; they are not there in what you see.'"[99]

Elsewhere Miriam thinks, with some crankiness, that similarly the "cold rheumy eyes" of two German men she sees seated on a park bench betray "the horrible leer of their talk:" "Looking up from it, scanning her in the spirit of the images of life they had evoked, . . . they identified her with their vision. She turned back towards the wide empty avenues. But there was no refuge in them. Their bleak emptiness reflected the thoughtless lives of English men. Behind her the two Germans . . . were the whole unconscious male mind of Europe surprised unmasked. . . . Men were mind and body, separated mind and body, looking out at women, below their unconscious men's brows, variously moulded and sanctified by thought, with one unvarying eye. There was no escape from its horrible blindness."[100]

One-eyed masculine vision characterizes the inter-personal relationships, thinks Miriam, of all people who simply accept values imposed upon them by civilization and who are wafted through a maze of sweetly smooth surface encounters during their lives: "She imagined herself [in the smooth-voiced world], seeing everyday incidents, hearing conversations slide from the surfaces of minds that in all their differences made one even surface, unconscious, unbroken, and maddeningly unquestioning and unaware. . . . They were unaware of anything . . . amoebae, awful determined unconscious . . . octupuses . . . frightful things with one eye, tentacles, poison-sacs . . . . The surface made them, not they the surface; rules. They were civilization. But they knew the rules; they knew how to do the surface. . . ."[101]

Appropriately, when Miriam's break with Hypo occurs, just after she has related to him her experiences with Quakerism, she and Hypo are playing upon words which refer once again to his perception:

> . . . "I must come down and have a look at your Quakers."
>
> "You wouldn't see them. Coming deliberately down, with a prepared spy-glass, you wouldn't see them."
>
> The train was moving. Leaning forth, he projected his husky voice: "What a silly thing to say, Miriam. What a damned silly thing to say."
>
> "Good-bye!" she cried, and strolled away. . . .[102]

At an earlier point in her relationship with Hypo, there is occasion for Miriam not only to denounce masculine vision, but also to explain to Hypo her feelings about feminine vision. During one of their conversations Hypo's championship of a scientifically "tested fact" which, in his opinion, reveals distinctions between the emotional stability of males and females evokes from Miriam a rebuke for what one might now refer to as the "linear" way of seeing in contrast to the ideal woman's "mosaic" way of seeing: "'Damn facts. Those arranged tests and their facts are utterly nothing at all. Women's controls appear to be feebler because they have so much more to control.

I don't mean physically. Mentally. By seeing everything simultaneously. Unless they are the kind of woman who has been warped into seeing only one thing at a time. Scientifically. They are freaks. Women see in terms of life. Men in terms of things, because their lives are passed amongst scraps.'"[103]

In Close Up Richardson identified the feminine principle with the silent film as opposed to the talkie. She insisted that the silent film leads vision past the rhythm of external facts and things to insight into the reality of life itself. In her essay, "The Film Gone Male," she deliberately linked the feminine principle, the principle of being, with the silent film, with what she called the film "in the days of its innocence."[104] She insisted that, like the silent film, "women . . . are humanity's silent half, without much faith in speech as a medium of communication."[105] And of the talkie she said: "In becoming audible and particularly in becoming a medium of propaganda, [the cinema] is doubtless fulfilling its destiny. But it is a masculine destiny. The destiny of planful becoming rather than of purposeful being. It will be the chosen battle-ground of rival patterns, plans, ideologies in endless succession and bewildering variety."[106] In Pilgrimage the success of Miriam's spiritual journey may be gauged in terms of its kinship to the experience of viewing silent film, and to the feminine principle of perception.

* * *

Miriam's thoughts about the manners of perception and expression which she differentiated by their sexual labels lead her to an awareness of the impasse which also confronts Richardson in creating a work of art that strains largely toward visual expression but depends solely on words and print. Unlike men, women, Richardson believed, utter their most profound statements prior to actually speaking; and therein lies the paradoxical situation she finds herself in with her own work:

> [Man is] lonely in a universe of things. . . . The chaos that torments him is his own rootless self. . . . Men weave golden things; thought, science, art, religion, upon a black background. They never are. They only make or do; unconscious of the quality of life as it passes. So are many women. But there is a moment in meeting a woman, any woman, the first moment, before speech, when everything becomes new; the utter astonishment of life is there, speech seems superfluous, even with women who have not consciously realized that life is astonishing. It persists through all the quotations and conformities, and is there again, the one underlying thing that women have to express to each other, at parting. So that between women, all the practical facts, the tragedies and comedies and events, are but ripples on a stream. It is not possible to share this sense of life with a man; least of all with those who are most alive to "the wonders of the universe." Men have no present; except sensuously. That would explain their ambition . . . and their doubting speculations about the future.
>
> Yet it would be easier to make all this clear to a man than to a woman. The very words expressing it have been made by men.[107]

Richardson's own sensitivity to the conviction that all words "have been made by men," and her belief that the masculine mind is prone to categorizing and labelling, made her conscious of the dilemma she faced as a writer. The reader could solve the problem of Richardson's dilemma by a willing suspension of media-literal-mindedness. Or, he might conclude that the severe dichotomy emphasized by Miriam is the narrator's device for self-parody.

Whatever the peculiar problems and strengths inherent in her choice of media, Richardson's prose nevertheless is the mediating agent through which the reader sees the world which Miriam sees. It is, of course, the world initially envisioned by Richardson as author, who is closely identified with Richardson as the third-person narrator of most of the novel. Richardson as narrator, however, is finally eclipsed by and merged with the first-person voice of Miriam. At the end of the novel Miriam, who is by then the first-person narrator and who, like Marcel at the end of Proust's _Remembrance of Things Past_, is prepared to become the writer Richardson already is, points to the transcendence of the woman writer's impasse by dwelling on the transmuting function of words, words which make images visible to the inner eye of the reader: "Imagination means holding an image in your mind. When it comes up of itself, or is summoned by something. Then it is not outside, but within you. And if you hold it, steadily, for long enough, you could write about it for ever."[108]

E. MODES OF SEEING (2): PERCEIVING AND BEING PERCEIVED

> THE MAN OF VISUAL CULTURE . . . DOES NOT THINK IN WORDS. . . . THE GESTURES OF VISUAL MAN ARE NOT INTENDED TO CONVEY CONCEPTS WHICH CAN BE EXPRESSED IN WORDS, BUT SUCH INNER EXPERIENCES, SUCH NON-RATIONAL EMOTIONS WHICH WOULD STILL REMAIN UNEXPRESSED WHEN EVRYTHING THAT CAN BE TOLD HAS BEEN TOLD. SUCH EMOTIONS LIE IN THE DEEPEST LEVELS OF THE SOUL AND CANNOT BE APPROACHED BY WORDS THAT ARE MERE REFLEXIONS OF CONCEPTS. (Béla Balázs, 1923)[109]

Miriam, at a certain point in her pilgrimage, is able to say that her meaning is defined not by flurries of busy pursuits but by her encounter with "current existence, the ultimate astonisher."[110] She is referring to a collaborative encounter at the centre of her "being." According to Miriam, men, in whom the predilection for "becoming," for ceaseless processes which engage only the intellectual faculties in logical manipulations of the surface appearances of life, is foremost, have exchanged their own and consequently any other possibility of "being" or "existence" for the superficial life. Thus Miriam finds Hypo a man "achieving, becoming, . . . delighting in the process. . . . And also a man seeming uncreated, without any existence worth the name."[111] Miriam hopelessly wishes to see "his world of ceaseless 'becoming' exchanged for one wherein should be included also the fact of 'being,' the overwhelming, smiling hint, proof against all possible tests, provided by the mere existence of anything, anywhere."[112]

For Richardson, the evidence for "being" in women--even those who, like Miriam in the earlier stages of her pilgrimage, are not aware of it--could always be found in their sensing of actual "existence," their own existence and the world's. Miriam states near the end of Pilgrimage: "women live, even if unknown to themselves, in the Now, the eternal moment, fully; that their sense of Being, whatever their discontents and longings, outdoes for most of them the desire to Become. Will triumph, throughout their lives. Is this conviction of the wonder of mere existence, the amazingness of there being anything anywhere, the secret of my feeling, wherever I go? . . .[113] Miriam's recollection in the novel of a personal experience gains in meaning when she comes to recognize the value of her child-like sensitivity to mere existence: "I felt all about me an awareness, conscious in the few, shared, like an infection, to some extent by all, of the strangeness of the adventure of being, of the fact of the existence, anywhere, of anything at all."[114]

Miriam's sensing of the reality of her own existence provides the ground for her acknowledging "the fact of the existence, anywhere, of anything at all;" and conversely, Miriam's acknowledgement of the existence of "anything at all" provides a deeply-realized confirmation of her own existence. That is, the existence of a world outside herself, like her reflection in a mirror, acknowledges her uniqueness and wholeness. Miriam is both the seer and the seen. "Instinctively," Richardson said of the ideal woman in a film-essay in Close Up, "she maintains a balance, the thing perceived and herself perceiving."[115] In Pilgrimage Richardson illustrated this point, for example, when Miriam recalls once having had a deep sense of recognizing and being recognized as she became aware of a spiritual kinship between herself and her grandmother: "I saw that I was looking at someone exactly my own age. . . . It's finding the same world in another person that moves you to your roots. . . . It makes you feel that you exist and can go on. Your sense of the world and of the astonishingness of there being anything anywhere . . . is confirmed when you find the same world and the same accepted astonishment in someone else. . . ."[116] Spiritual collaborations such as this one are not restricted in Pilgrimage to Miriam's relations with people but extend also to relations with the entire physical world which is visible or which is made visible to her.

Throughout the novel, then, the inner and outer worlds of Miriam interact. What is of most interest in terms of this study is that in Pilgrimage the depth or the extent or the quality of Miriam's inner feelings are in various ways revealed and corroborated by the nature of her visual perception at any given time. That is, the nature of Miriam's feelings, or attitudes, or awarenesses, is often revealed to the reader by the accompanying visual descriptions or visual context. Miriam's actual or imagined visual worlds provide for the reader a kind of index to the quality or nature of Miriam's psychic feelings and of their relation to the pilgrimage in general. Indeed, Richardson's technique is such that the visual descriptions or the direct setting down of images evoke in the reader responses which resonate in sympathy with the responses of Miriam, regardless of whether or not Miriam herself can actually articulate at the moment the precise meaning of her own visual perceptions.

A limited but nevertheless helpful illustration of the collaboration of Miriam's inner and outer worlds is seen in the opening lines of Chapter VI of The Tunnel. There Miriam's experience of the external world is a precise gauge of her interior state of mind. Feeling at first "non-existent," Miriam experiences a stultifying physical perception which registers only the surface appearance of the landscape. Then, simultaneously with her realizing that "she was somebody," her perception alters as a breach, to use Richardson's term, is made in the normal surface rhythm of the senses:

> Miriam sat on a damp wooden seat at the station. Shivering with exhaustion, she looked across at the early morning distance, misty black and faint misty green. . . . Something had happened to it. It was not beautiful; or anything. It was not anything. . . . That was the punishment. . . . The landscape was dead. All that had come to an end. Her nimble lifeless mind noted the fact. There was dismay in it.

> Staring at the landscape she felt the lifelessness of her face; as if something had brushed across it and swept the life away, leaving her only sight. She could never feel any more.
>
> Behind her fixed eyes, something new seemed moving forward with a strange indifference. Suddenly the landscape unrolled. The rim of the horizon was no longer the edge of the world. She lost sight of it in the rolling out of the landscape in her mind, out and out, in a light easy stretch, showing towns and open country and towns again, seas and continents on and on; empty and still. . . . She drifted back to herself and clung, bracing herself. She was somebody.[117]

During a moment of spiritual and emotional inertness, Miriam views what appears to be a bleakly dead landscape. As emotional coldness gives way to depth of inner feeling the landscape is animated.

The two phases of perception in the illustration cited above, phases involving first emotional inertness and then emotional participation, provide parallels for Miriam's view of the two categories of seeing, masculine and feminine respectively. She describes, as we have already noted, masculine perception in terms of the rigid aspect of the camera eye, and feminine perception in terms of sensitivity to inner realities beyond visible surfaces, including those of the photograph. In Remembrance of Things Past Marcel Proust provided an illustration of the dynamics of what Miriam would call the operation of the masculine eye. Proust's narrator makes a distinction between what he thinks of, on the one hand, as the mechanical perception of an eye which is devoid of emotion and memory and, on the other hand, the emotional perception of an eye charged with collaborative intimacy and knowledge of what it sees. The particular occasion involves the fleeting glimpse the narrator has of his grandmother just prior to her becoming aware of his presence in the room, and thus just prior to her acknowledgement of him--prior, that is, to the reciprocating, mutual acknowledgement which would complete a spiritual circuit in the manner in which the spiritual circuit between Miriam and her grandmother is complete:

> The process that mechanically occurred in my eyes when I caught sight of my grandmother was indeed a photograph. We never see the people who are dear to us save in the animated system, the perpetual motion of our incessant love for them, which before allowing the images that their faces present to reach us catches them in its vortex, flings them back upon the idea that we have always had of them, makes them adhere to it, coincide with it. How, . . . since every casual glance is an act of necromancy, each face that we love a mirror of the past, how could I have failed to overlook what in her had become dulled and changed, seeing that in the most trivial spectacles of our daily life, our eye, charged with thought, neglects, as would a classical tragedy, every image that does not assist the action of the play and retains only those that may help to make its purpose intelligible. But if, in place of our eye, it should be a purely material object, a photographic plate, that has watched the action, then what we shall see, in the courtyard of the Institute, for example, will be, instead of the dignified emergence of an Academician who is going to hail a cab, his staggering gait, his precautions to avoid tumboling upon his back, the parabola of his fall, as though he were drunk, or the ground frozen over. So it is when some casual sport of chance prevents our intelligent and pious affection from coming forward in time to hide from our eyes what they ought never to behold, when it is forestalled by our eyes, and they, arising first in the field and having it to themselves, set to work mechanically, like films, and shew us, in place of the loved friend

who has long ago ceased to exist but whose death our affection has always hitherto kept concealed from us, the new person whom a hundred times daily that affection has clothed with a dear and cheating likeness.[118]

F. SIGHT AND INSIGHT (1): MIRIAM

WRITING CAN RECREATE THE INTERIOR LIFE MOST NATURALLY BECAUSE OUR MINDS THINK CHIEFLY IN WORDS. BUT WE DO OUR DREAMING IN IMAGES, AND THE CAMERA IS A DREAMING AS WELL AS A SEEING INSTRUMENT. IT IS EASIER THEN AND MORE 'NATURAL' FOR THE CAMERA TO DREAM AND FOR THE WRITER TO THINK.
(Evelyn T. Riesman, 1957)[119]

Dorothy Richardson's emphasis on the importance of visual continuity in Miriam's personal life can be related to her interest in the visual continuity of film. The overall heading of Richardson's series of essays on film, "Continuous Performance," reflects one part of this aspect of the film, as screenings in Richardson's day would run uninterruptedly for what she called the "continuous performance public,"[120] a public of which she saw herself as a part. Richardson claimed that all of a film's attractions or finer points "are ultimately dependent, for their pull on us, upon the peculiar quality of the film's continuous performance, the unchallenged achievement that so overwhelmingly stated itself when the first 'Animated Pictures' cast their uncanny spell with the dim, blurred, continuously sparking representation of a locomotive advancing full steam upon the audience, majestic and terrible."[121]

Always, however, in films as in life, there was, for Richardson, a "something else," a "something standing out from the cinematograph show" and inviting the "'real self'--our larger and deeper being," to make itself known to the individual--it might be added, to the individual with the potential for feminine perception. An individual's collaborative interaction with film, as Miriam's (and, to a lesser extent, the reader's) with the visual aspect of life for which film is the model in Pilgrimage, will lead ultimately beyond or away from a surface apprehension of the external world and of the self, and will culminate in a metamorphosis of both the external world and the self. "The surface shape is powerful, every one is in it," said Richardson in Pilgrimage, "but in every one, alone, often unconsciously, is something, a real inside personality that is turned away from the surface."[122]

Pilgrimage is, first of all, Miriam's continuous visual event. Miriam's is a world structured largely in terms of the surface shapes of the "cinematograph show" of life, but it is also a world in which the regular rhythm of shapes at times is superseded, as has already been stated, by visual phenomena marking Miriam's encounters with a spiritual reality that is "turned away from the surface."

* * *

References establishing the existence of the surface show of Miriam's world, even that part of her world seen only by her inner eye, seem almost endless in Pilgrimage. Many excerpts from the novel might be gathered to provide a checklist of passages which establish the impression that Miriam's world is predominantly visual. I shall note here only references to the states of mind, the memories of the past, and the anticipations of the future which constitute her inner world, or as Wyndham Lewis would have called it, her "inner cinema:"

> [Miriam was] confused by a picture coming between her and her surroundings like a filmy lantern slide;[123]
>
> Pictures came in the darkness . . . lamplit rooms, gardens, understanding;[124]
>
> Things were coming to her out of the fire, fresh and new, seen for the first time; a flood of images. She watched them with eyes suddenly cool and sleepless;[125]
>
> scenes from the future, moving in soundless backgrounds, came streaming unsummoned into her mind;[126]
>
> here within, lit up as if by a suddenly switched on electric light, was one's own realization going back and back; in pictures that grew clearer, each time something happened that switched on a light within the black spaces of your mind. . . . [T]he inmost reality comes to you when you are alone;[127]
>
> The rosy light shone into far-away scenes with distant friends. They came into her mind rapidly one by one, and stayed grouped in a radiance, sharper and clearer than in experience;[128]
>
> Lying sleepless, . . . she watched the pictures that crowded the darkness;[129]
>
> Two scenes flashed forth from the panorama beyond the darkness;[130]
>
> She walked home amidst the procession of scenes, grouped and blending all about her;[131]
>
> Single, detached figures came vividly before her;[132]

> All the places she had known came unsummoned before her mind's eye; . . . so far away that several could be focussed at once.[133]
>
> there passed before her inward vision a picture. . . . It slid away. Joyously she recalled it, supplying time and place, colour and sound and living warmth. And it stood there before her;[134]
>
> her mind moved rapidly from picture to picture;[135]
>
> [his question dissolved] her mind's fixed image of the room in a series of distant views competing for her attention;[136]
>
> she saw, in a swift series of dissolving views, her own career;[137]
>
> Shifting her gaze, she saw . . . scene upon scene from the depths of the years;[138]
>
> [The face of the clock always brought] the time of day to her mind in swiftly moving, stereoscopic scenes;[139]
>
> [Miriam saw] a visible background of dissolving views freed from their anchorage in space and time;[140]
>
> Miriam departed on a mental tour. Picture after picture emerged from the past;[141]
>
> she saw within her mind, evoked in all its first clarity and revealed as immortal, [a] hitherto unpondered vision;[142]
>
> One after another the scenes passed before [her], each with its unique charm.[143]

* * *

"Music, invisible, 'coming out of space,'" Richardson wrote in Close Up of the film viewing experience, "enhances the faculty of vision."[144] For Miriam, too, music intensifies the effect of the visual environment, and often creates moments which stand out from the normal surfaces of the environment. During the vorspielen at the

German school in Waldstrasse, for example, Miriam comes to see beyond the visual reality of her surroundings as she moves to a state of being where her vision brings her only abstract forms:

> Emma Bergmann was playing. The single notes of the opening motif of Chopin's Fifteenth Nocturne fell pensively into the waiting room. Miriam, her fatigue forgotten, slid to a featureless freedom. It seemed to her that the light with which the room was filled grew brighter and clearer. She felt that she was looking at nothing and yet was aware of the whole room like a picture in a dream. Fear left her. The human forms all round her lost their power. They grew suffused and dim. . . . The pensive swing of the music changed to urgency and emphasis. . . . It came nearer and nearer. It did not come from the candle-lit corner where the piano was. . . . It came from everywhere. It carried her out of the house, out of the world.
>
> It hastened with her, on and on towards great brightness. . . . Everything was growing brighter and brighter. . . .[145]

Much as in Proust's Remembrance of Things Past, music in Pilgrimage has the power to make the listener and viewer transcend the surface confines of the physical present and to recall visual scenes from the past. At Oberland (in Switzerland), for example, more than ten years following her stay in Germany, Miriam hears a theme being played on a piano, and the past--in terms of a visual world which breaks into the visual rhythms of the present--is revived in her memory: "Through all the years she had tried in vain to recall it, and now it came, to welcome her, piling joy on joy, setting its seal upon the days ahead and taking her back to her Germany. . . . For an instant she was back in it, passing swiftly from scene to scene of the months in Waldstrasse. . . ."[146]

Miriam herself theorizes about music's function as an aid to vision. On one occasion she recalls having stated "that a musical accompaniment, although in advance it seemed to promise a division of one's attention, actually had the reverse effect, helping, with its unaccentuated flow, to focus and vitalize the images evoked by a poem."[147] She recalls too having thought that "music favoured the reception of poetry partly by causing the shapeless mental faculties that deal with things, to abdicate in favour of the faculty that has the sense of form and sees things in relationship."[148] Indeed, sound often translates into visual forms in Miriam's mind. The Waldstrasse nocturne, for example, "was a shape of tones caught from a pattern woven continuously and drawn, with its rhythm ready set, gleaming into sight. The way of the best nocturnes."[149] Again, when she is at the sea-side with her ailing mother, Miriam on one occasion is listening to a band: "She waited for the loud gay jerky tripping of the second movement. When it crashed brassily out the scene grew vivid."[150] On still another occasion, a "smooth firm foreign voice flung out a shapely little fragment of song. Miriam watched its outline."[151]

* * *

Dreams make up many of the more remarkable moments of visual activity in Miriam's life. Indeed, as is pointed out by the narrator in Pilgrimage, a dream-like quality, a quality reflecting the reality of her inner self, deeply imbues many of Miriam's waking moments: "all the real part of your life has a real dream in it," says the narrator; "some of the real dream part of you coming true."[152] In Miriam's life, dream and day-dream are often part of a seamless visual continuity:

> . . . Miriam lay watching the pawnbroker's daughter in the little room at the back of the shop, in the shop, back again in the little room, coming and going. There was a shining on her face and on her hair. Miriam watched until she fell asleep.
>
> She dreamed she was in the small music-room in the old Putney school. . . .[153]

A description of Miriam's "favourite dream" very early in the novel establishes itself as an important feature which in various forms emerges from time to time upon the visual landscape of her life: "floating through clouds and above tree-tops and villages. She had almost brushed the tree-tops, that had been the happiest moment, and had caught sight of a circular seat round the trunk of a large old tree, and a group of white cottages."[154] This particular dream, deeply meaningful to Miriam who, upon recalling it to herself, exclaims, "[i]t's me,"[155] is the prefiguration of visually similar and increasingly fuller realizations which Miriam comes to on her pilgrimage. Her delight in and the sense of self-knowledge related to the tree, which in the dream is enclosed, symbolically, in a circle, are anticipations of Miriam's ultimate epiphany near the end of the novel. There, in acknowledgement of her circling back to her real self, to her own beginnings, it is in her perception of a tree that she simultaneously and completely realizes the profound significance of her growing awareness of what it means to feel, "[i]t's me."

*   *   *

Pilgrimage itself contains no explicit internal references to the cinema, even though the chronology of the narrative (approximately 1892-1915) parallels the passage of the years that saw the advent of the silent film. Thus no literal parallelism is explicitly indicated between Miriam's and the film spectator's situations. The reader's attention is at times deliberately drawn, however, to items related to cinema-like apparatus, the effect of which underlines the reader's awareness of the primacy of the visual sense in Miriam's life. For example, on one occasion while she is recalling her childhood pleasures, Miriam establishes a sense of her attachment to toys such as the kaleidoscope and the stereoscope: "'. . . The kaleidoscope. Do you remember looking at the kaleidoscope? I used to cry about it sometimes at night; thinking of the patterns I had not seen. I thought there was a new pattern every time you shook it for ever. . . .' She rushed on to the stereoscope, her eyes still on the little cardboard stage, hearing the sound of the paper scraping over the little wooden roller as the printed scenes came round backwards or forwards. . . ."[156]

A slide show, which Miriam watches during her visit to a scientific lecture on the photographer, Daguerre, evokes in her intense feelings of delight: "When the colour photographs came, Miriam was too happy for thought. Pictures of stained glass, hard crude clear brilliant opaque flat colour, stood in miraculous squares on the screen, and pieces of gardens, grass and flowers and trees, shining with a shadeless blinding brilliance."[157] Unlike Mr. Hancock, her scientifically-minded, masculine-eyed companion at the lecture, Miriam feels keenly that the pictures in themselves, in being only of the senses, were superficial in comparison to the presence, the "something else," the "real certain thing," which she feels standing "brilliantly" behind them: "there was something else in the things as they stood, blinding, there. . . . It was something that she had seen somewhere, often. . . . There was something in this intense hard rich colour like something one sometimes saw when it wasn't there, a sudden brightening and brightening of all colours till you felt something must break if they grew any brighter--or in the dark, or in one's mind, suddenly, at any time, unearthly brilliance. . . . [I]t was the real certain thing; the one real certain happy thing."[158]

In all of Pilgrimage it is through the breaches--sometimes, as in the illustration just cited, breaches of "unearthly brilliance"--which occur from time to time in the regular "registration of impressions"[159] that Miriam increasingly gains the sense of having access to something prefigured or symbolized by the occurrence of those breaches, or gaps. There is, she feels, something vaster, something beyond, something within--that which she at first can identify only as a "something else."

Again and again in Pilgrimage the importance for Miriam of the relationship between surface pictures, whether seen externally or only in the mind, and the less tangible "something else," is explicitly stressed. For example, while Miriam is at Brighton, she takes visual cognizance of the scene around her, and her thoughts move beyond the surface impressions: "her thoughts of the great brow and downward sweep of cliff and the sea coming up to it was not a picture, it was a thing, . . . it was an experience, perhaps the most important thing in life, . . . a thing belonging to that strange inner life and independent of everybody."[160] Throughout the novel the "cinematograph show" of life, with its flow of surface scenes, provides Miriam with a visual context which, if she cooperates with it, offers her insights usually accompanied simultaneously by renewed visual experience which transcends normal sight: "there is within oneself something that ceaselessly contemplates 'forgotten' things--. . . even a photograph . . . has the power of making one enter a kingdom one hardly knew one possessed."[161]

G. SIGHT AND INSIGHT (2): THE READER

BY RECORDING SELECTED IMPRESSIONS, THOUGHTS, AND SENSATIONS OF HIS CHARACTERS, THE NOVELIST CAN CREATE (AS DOES THE CINEMA) THE ILLUSION THAT WHAT IS HAPPENING IS HAPPENING WHILE WE READ, IS CONTINUOUS, AND IS HAPPENING ALWAYS IN THE PRESENT. (Weller Embler, 1971)[162]

Dorothy Richardson used a variety of literary devices in Pilgrimage to invite the reader to occupy a life-space which to varying degrees coincides with Miriam's. At times, particularly where her technique mimes film, she has invested the reader with a status essentially like Miriam's--essentially that of the film spectator, as Richardson described him. The visual patterns and techniques which measure Miriam's own changing distance from and insight into reality, the reality implicit in Miriam's seeing beyond surface structures, are used by Richardson both to let the reader interpret Miriam's current state of being, and also to let the reader enter frequently into a "seeing" role which is quite in phase with that of Miriam. In actuality, of course, it has to be kept in mind that any alignment of Miriam's and the reader's visual perception cannot be said to occur literally, if only because Miriam's is a physical vision which is constant and direct, while the reader's vision is dependent on the evocative and directive power of words.

Even after having taken into account the qualitative difference wrought upon any event by the mediation of prose, it is tempting to conclude upon a cursory judgment of the text that, in terms of Richardson's aesthetics, the reader's vision consistently parallels that of Miriam. However, Richardson at times has refrained entirely from "showing" the reader directly, or even describing to the reader obliquely, the substance of Miriam's visual perceptions, and yet at the same time has made the reader aware that certain pictorial "scenes" are flashing before Miriam's inner or her outer eye. On the other hand, Richardson sometimes has employed severe literary techniques which anticipate what is called the "camera eye" in novels such as Robbe-Grillet's Jealousy.[163]

Since it has been Richardson's method to use Miriam's experience as the only guide for the reader's experience, she has been able to reflect the variations within the mind of Miriam by varying the reader's distance from the standard or norm of a purely "cinematic" world; and variations, especially "breaches," within the visual world perceived by the reader further guide the reader to a close knowledge of Miriam's inner world. For example, within the spectrum of Miriam's visual experiences the reader is invited at frequent intervals to participate with extraordinary directness in Miriam's life. The evocative use of visual imagery or visual description, especially when it is self-consciously employed, is central to

Richardson's prose style. Her use of the visual element was the result of her determined attempt not to let her art violate the free will of the reader. As a convention, it lets the reader identify with Miriam simply by setting before him much of what Miriam herself sees, without overtly taking him on a "conducted tour" through the material. Given her aesthetic desire not to interfere with the reader, and given the sensory limitations and strengths of literature, Richardson's use of visual imagery was an indispensible convention for her insistence as a writer on remaining within the life-space of Miriam. In literature the visual sense more than any other can be used to make the reader's point-of-view coincide with that of a character. Indeed, in the case of Miriam, it is through Richardson's consistent demand on the reader's visualizing sense that the reader comes to know Miriam by the very means through which she comes to know herself. Richardson's was a convention which recalls the cinema with its "impersonal" pictures, each, she repeatedly stated, "telling its own story"[164] without the intervention of conventionally overt guiding forces.

One of the most dramatic instances of Richardson's giving the reader the opportunity to empathize with Miriam's visual perception of the "cinematograph show" of her environment, and of a breach in that show, involves a self-conscious attempt by Richardson to utilize cinema technique in the re-creation of Miriam's visual experience.

The instance occurs quite unexpectedly in Honeycomb (1917), in the context of events which otherwise are technically inauspicious. On this occasion Richardson used technique in an obvious way to interpret the sense of Miriam's experience and to provide the parameters which determine the sense of the reader's experience. The technique itself is a clear enunciation of Richardson's attempts to avoid placing strictures on the reader's imagination, as the visual content emerges bare and unimpeded by narrative interference:

> The West End street . . . grey buildings rising on either side, angles sharp against the sky . . . softened angles of buildings against other buildings . . . high moulded angles soft as crumb, with deep undershadows . . . creepers fraying from balconies . . . strips of window blossoms across the buildings, scarlet yellow, high up; a confusion of lavender and white pouching out along the dipping sill . . . a wash of green creeper up a white painted house-front . . . patches of shadow and bright light. . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> She sped along looking at nothing. Shops passed by, bright endless caverns screened with glass . . . the bright teeth of a grand piano running along the edge of a darkness, a cataract of light pouring down its raised crumpling stalks; sly, silky, ominous furs; metals, cold and clanging, brandishing the light; close prickling fire of jewels. . . .
>
> She pulled up sharply in front of a window. The pavement round it was clear, allowing her to stand rooted where she had been walking, in the middle of the pavement, in the midst of the pavement, in the midst of the tide flowing from the clear window, a soft fresh tide of sunlit colours . . . clear green glass shelves laden with shapes of fluted glass, glinting transparencies of mauve and amber and green, rose-pearl and milky blue, welded to a flowing tide, freshening and flowing through her blood, a sea rising and falling with her breathing.
>
> The edge had gone from the keenness of the light. The street was a happy, sunny, simple street--small. She was vast. She could gather up the buildings

> in her arm and push them away, clearing the sky . . . a strange darkling, and she would sleep. She felt drowsy, a drowsiness in her brain and limbs and great strength, and hunger.[165] [The ellipses, except those at the end of the first two paragraphs respectively, are Richardson's.]

This rendering of the visually-sensitized consciousness of Miriam is unusual technically in terms of the overall style of the novel. It is at the same time a central indicator of the general nature of Richardson's "cinematic" method. It reveals Richardson's affinity with the stream-of-consciousness writers. It supports, too, the validity of Richardson's own preference for the label, "slow-motion photography," rather than the label, "stream-of-consciousness," to describe her work.[166]

* * *

There are as well in Pilgrimage other forms of visual expression, of starkly visualized experience, which Richardson employed to invite the reader's imaginative and visualizing participation. Often Richardson would place visualized objects, which Miriam sees, within a framing device--like the "pictures," for example, Miriam sees "gleaming in a window"[167] on one occasion. This framing device functions in the manner of a film screen. The reader shares with Miriam not only the physical appearance of objects, often objects in movement, but also the relation of objects to each other within the frame. In her frequent use of the framing-device Richardson was employing an aspect of the film viewing experience as the model for engaging the reader, as Miriam is engaged, in visual experiences leading to contemplation and creative collaboration.

The effects of Richardson's deliberate establishment of and the reader's knowledge of Miriam's angle of vision and of the composition of the picture within the frame are best clarified by observing an illustration of Richardson's method: "Through the french windows of the new drawing-room Miriam saw a group of figures moving towards the end of the garden. In a moment they would have reached the low brick wall at the end of the garden. They might stand talking there with their heads outlined against the green painted trellis-work that ran along the top of the wall. . . ."[168] The description of the group of strolling figures provides a sense of movement within the context of the frame. In another instance in which visual images appear in a frame, Miriam's head-movements, which make her eye function like a mobile camera, facilitate the creation of a sense of visual objects in movement on a screen:

> she went into the brilliance of the window space. The outside world appeared; a long row of dormer windows and the square tops of the larger windows below them, the windows black or sheeny grey in the light, cut out against the dinginess of smoke-grimed walls. The long strip of roof sloping back from the dormers was a pure even dark grey. She bent to see the sky, clear soft heavy grey, striped by the bars of her window. . . . To the left the trees were black against pure grey, to the right they stood spread and bunched in front of

> the distant buildings blocking the vista. Running across the rose-washed facade of the central mass she could just make out "Edward's Family Hotel" in large black letters.[169]

The selection from Pilgrimage which was cited by Leon Edel,[170] and which constitutes the closing lines of Pointed Roofs, provides a more extreme form of Richardson's miming the action of a mobile camera eye to create the sense of a moving picture within the context of a frame.

* * *

Film, in its essence a medium dealing with pictures of actual visual objects, is more precise and more explicit than literature in its ability to arrange and select specific, vividly-defined visual objects and invest them with symbolical meaning. Such meaning is derived not necessarily from antecedents external to the work but from the position or functioning of the object in a series of visual or narrative contexts within the work itself. Richardson, in creating the visual world which is Miriam's to perceive, constantly has emphasized the significance of things through their visual associations and visual quality. Richardson has tried as much as possible to use her medium as though it were film, which, she recognized, has the power to raise the level of significance of everyday visual objects. She wrote in 1931: "Everyone knows that amongst its thousand and one potentialities the film possesses that of being a mirror for the customary and restoring its essential quality."[171] In the "cinematic" atmosphere of Pilgrimage, visual images which recur in one section or in several parts of the novel come to reveal their "essential quality," both to Miriam and to the reader. The effect of their occurrence, on both Miriam and the reader, like the effect of the film as Richardson quite simply described it, is "the awakening of the imaginative power, the gift of expansion, of moving . . . into a new dimension of consciousness."[172]

Richardson often has attempted to mime the texture or the effects of film by references to colours and to visual objects, as well as by her literal, visual reproduction of such items as signs or advertisements. In their effects the techniques reinforce the reader's impression of seeing what Miriam sees, and also, consequently, feeling what Miriam feels. The techniques, it must be kept in mind, are used by Richardson to complement the theme of pilgrimage and the principle of creative collaboration.

In Pilgrimage recurring references to particular colours become one means not only of transmitting Miriam's visual experiences but also of indicating her changing moods. By a combination of their commonly-known symbolic values and, more specifically, by their association in the text with certain objects, events, or feelings, references to colour serve Richardson's purpose of making the reader see as Miriam sees. While Richardson opposed the use of colour in the cinema because, like synchronized dialogue, it interferes with the eye/mind's imaginative involvement with the moving images, no such interference--indeed, just the opposite--occurs when colour-references are used in prose.

The use of colour-references was also one of Richardson's means for developing the structure of Pilgrimage. Lengthy passages of the novel are at times bathed, as it were, in even tones of colour. An analogous but crude practice which comes to mind involves the early use of tinting in films to elicit or indicate desired moods or effects during a particular series of shots or sequences.[173]

A few examples will indicate by their context the values which Richardson at times attributed to, and drew from, grey as well as gold and its related colours, yellow and brown:

> Inside the house a cold grey twilight was blotting out the warm brownness;[174]
>
> [She noticed] a large brown dinginess, one rich warm even tone everywhere;[175]
>
> the whole of the time in Germany was beautiful, golden happy light;[176]
>
> The woman did not see the wonderful gold-brown light in the carriage;[177]
>
> men wander in a grey desert of agnosticism;[178]
>
> she was observing the deepness of the room's grey light. Another storm-cloud.[179]

Richardson's, or Miriam's, preference, as indicated by the preceding references taken from different parts of the novel, is for the richness and warmth of the gold colours, and the reader is easily conditioned to respond to the meaning of the colour accordingly. Thus when large sections of the novel are bathed in a sustained, golden glow, they evoke in the reader the sense of the inward joy which Miriam is experiencing, and invite the reader to participate in that joy with her. Throughout Dawn's Left Hand, for example, Miriam basks in the golden light of her recollections of her Oberland experience. She remembers the Oberland days as a "golden eternity,"[180] a "golden glow,"[181] a "golden life within her life."[182] She saw it proceeding simultaneously with what she called the "fortnight of dark London days."[183] At a later point in the novel the feeling returns: "Oberland again; its golden light, and its way of making its outer world conform to its inner."[184] All of life had become for her a "golden leisure"[185] with "golden light giving an ethereal quality"[186] to its special moments.

The recurrence of objects, too, provides a reflection or correlative of Miriam's inner life. For example, "the mystery of her passion for soap"[187] imbues a visual object, often encountered in the pages of Pilgrimage, with personal, symbolical significance. A new cake of soap gives Miriam the assurance of mysteriously new days to follow: "To buy a new cake of soap is to buy a fresh stretch of days,"[188] says the narrator: "all great days had soap, impressing its qualities upon you, during your most intense moments of anticipation, as a prelude. And the realization of a good day past, coming with the early morning hour, is accompanied by soap. Soap is with you when you are in that state of feeling life at first hand that makes even the best things that can happen important not so much in themselves as in the way they make you conscious of life, and of yourself living. Every day, even those that are called ordinary days, with its miracle of return from sleep, is heralded by soap, summoning its retinue of companion days."[189]

Other items, too, recur and take on symbolical significance in terms of Miriam's world. The two references to the large Oriental plaque with the tiger in its midst, for example, are separated by 775 pages in the novel. Yet the plaque functions, first of all, in simplest cinematic terms by taking on a heightened visual quality. In the first reference to the plaque, which is in Mr. Hancock's room, where on this occasion it falls and breaks in two, the reader sees it in great detail as does Miriam: "Miriam's eyes went . . . to the violent soft rich red and blue and dull green covering the huge concave disk from side to side. It appeared to represent a close thicket of palm fronds, thin flat fingers, superimposed and splaying out in all directions over the deep blue background. In the centre appeared the head and shoulders of an enormous tiger, coming sinuously forward, one great paw planted on the greenery near the foremost middle edge of the plaque."[190]

Several volumes later, Chapter IV of Revolving Lights opens with this abrupt description: "The tiger stepping down his blue plaque. The one thing in the room that nothing could influence. All the other beautiful things change. They are beautiful, for a moment, again and again; giving out their expression, and presently frozen stiff, having no expression. The blue plaque, intense fathomless eastern blue, the thick spiky grey-green sharply shaped leaves, going up for ever, the heavy striped beast for ever curving through, his great paw always newly set on the base of the plaque; inexhaustible, never looked at enough; always bringing the same joy. If ever the memory of this room fades away, the blue plaque will remain."[191] This paragraph, which introduces the chapter following the one taken up with Miriam's spiritually critical visit to Hypo and Alma Wilson's country-home, opens with what might be a literary equivalent of a film shot. The camera eye, as it were, does all the primary work in the paragraph, simply by making the reader see. It recalls a sense of the place and time of the earlier occasion, when the now-mended plaque had fallen and broken in two. Analogous to Miriam's own pilgrimage from a divided self to a woman at one with herself, the tiger in its garden-like environment is a metaphor for her experience.

Gardens and, as we have already noted, especially trees represent for Miriam the return to the self she was as a child, a self made aware of its very being by the acknowledging presence of the natural environment. Richardson's personal recollection of her "first direct knowledge" of woods and hills and rivers and gardens, which, she wrote, alone "brought the sense of existing,"[192] was the source of the similar sensibility in Miriam. On one occasion when Miriam's external life is coloured by gloomy circumstances, the garden is the untouched image that restores a sense of calmness and oneness deeply within her: "far away from the everlasting accusations of humanity . . . was something cool and fresh--endless garden."[193] Miriam gives her own sense of the importance of this recurring visual image, a sense of being "'back in the moment of seeing for the first time those flower-beds and banks of flowers blazing in the morning sunlight, that smelt of the flowers and was one with them and me and the big bees crossing the path, low, on a level with my face.'"[194]

Thirdly, among the visual devices which Richardson used to let the reader see what Miriam sees was her use in the novel of the typographical duplication of actual visual stimuli. Signs or advertisements, which constitute the most literal use of written words as they are commonly found in films, may readily be incorporated into the text of the novel in the form literally identical with that seen by Miriam. Their use in the text carries to a logical, technical extreme Richardson's insistence on showing the reader what Miriam actually sees. Thus, in one sense, these visual stimuli bring the reader closest to Miriam.

A dramatic use of signs, as they function to reveal and gauge the progress of Miriam's expanding inner awareness and spiritual strength, is the suggested and finally the explicitly stated recurrence of a sign which is first associated with Miriam's traumatic feeling of loss and guilt concerning the death of her mother. Chapter VII of The Tunnel contains the first reference to the sign. Miriam's tenseness is stressed by the brevity of the chapter, which is here quoted in full:

> Why must I always think of her in this place? . . . It is always worst just along here. . . . Why do I always forget there's this piece . . . always be hurrying along seeing nothing and then, suddenly, Teetgen's Teas and this row of shops? I can't bear it. I don't know what it is. It's always the same. I always feel the same. It is sending me mad. One day it will be worse. If it gets any worse I shall be mad. Just here. Certainly. Something is wearing out of me. I am meant to go mad. If not, I should not always be coming along this piece without knowing it, which ever street I take. Other people would know the streets apart. I don't know where this bit is or how I get to it. I come every day because I am meant to go mad here. Something that knows brings me here and is making me go mad because I am myself and nothing changes me.[195]

The "her" of the first line must be Miriam's mother who, the reader gathers only obliquely, takes her own life at a point which, narratively speaking, occurs near the end of the preceding volume of Pilgrimage, Honeycomb. The present stressful moment of Miriam's recollection of her mother anticipates at a rather early point in the novel the later ascendancy of the first person narrator in Pilgrimage.

The effect of this passage is to underline Miriam's feelings of helplessness and despair, feelings which are set off by her visual sense of the locale into which she wanders.

About four years later (in Deadlock) the scene bursts again before Miriam, this time before her inner eye. But now her encountering the scene cleanses her of her former fear and insecurity as she walks "into the multitudinous pattering of heavy rain:" "scenes flashed forth from the panorama beyond the darkness, and . . . she saw, narrow and gaslit, the little unlocated street that had haunted her first London years, herself flitting into it, always unknowingly, from a maze of surrounding streets, feeling uneasy, recognizing it, hurrying to pass its awful centre where she must read the name of a shop. . . . Her imagined figure passed from the haunted scene, and from the vast spread of London the tide flowed through it, leaving it a daylit part of the whole, its spell broken and gone."[196]

Some four or five years still later (in Dawn's Left Hand), while spiritually luxuriating in the richness of the post-Oberland "golden" period of her life, Miriam once again finds herself actually "glancing along the shop-fronts of this mean little back street:"

> Teetgen's Teas, she noted, in grimed, gilt lettering above a dark and dingy little shop. . . .
>
> Teetgen's Teas. . . .
>
> And this street, still foul and dust-filled, but full now also of the light flooding down upon and

> the air flowing through the larger streets with which in her mind it was clearly linked, was the place where in the early years she would suddenly find herself lost and helplessly aware of what was waiting for her eyes the moment before it appeared: the grimed gilt lettering that *forced me to gaze into the darkest moment of my life and to remember that I had forfeited my share in humanity for ever and must go quietly and alone until the end.*
>
> *And now their power has gone. They can bring back only the memory of a darkness and horror, to which, then, something has happened, begun to happen?*[197]

Having felt her new freedom, Miriam "glanced back over her shoulder at the letters now away behind her and rejoiced in freedom that allowed her to note their peculiarities of size and shape."[198]

The grimed, gilt lettering, like the other visual referents which she used, gave Richardson a way of letting the reader relate to cues in a manner which reflects--both at the sensual level and, by implication, at the spiritual level--Miriam's own relation to the actual, visible presence of those cues.

H. MIRIAM'S PILGRIMAGE: THE SIGHT AND SENSE OF SELF

> THE CINEMA, OF ALL THE ARTS, POSSESSES THE MEANS OF EXPLOITING [THE] ELEMENT OF FANTASY TO THE UTMOST LIMIT. ON THE SCREEN WE CAN SIT INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OURSELVES AT THE SAME TIME. THE VEIL BETWEEN DREAM AND REALITY, WHEN SUFFUSED WITH LIGHT, IS CAPABLE OF YIELDING THE MODULATIONS OF THE SPIRIT WHICH ANIMATES LIFE. EXHAUSTED BY LONGING, THE SPIRIT OF MAN STRIVES PERPETUALLY TO SURRENDER ITS BURDEN THROUGH WONDER. THE ORGAN OF THE SOUL IS THE EYE WHICH, HAVING BEHELD ITS CREATION, SEES THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THAT WHICH IT ORIGINALLY LONGED TO BEHOLD. A THIRD EYE RENDERS BACK THE WONDER WHICH SURROUNDS THE MEANING OF CREATION. ONLY THE BLIND CAN EXPRESS TRUE LONGING, JUST AS THE SEER CAN EXPRESS ONLY ECSTASY. ENTERING THE REALM OF VISION WE MOVE WITH THE FLEET HARMONY OF ANGELS. WONDER EXPANDS THE INNER ORB, MAKING IT WAX LIKE A GOLDEN MOON. AT THE FULL THE DARKEST RECESSES OF THE SOUL ARE ILLUMINED. IT IS THEN WE SUSTAIN, WITH OUR BREATH MERELY, THE CHANGELESS UNIVERSE IN WHICH FORM AND IMAGE OBEY THE CEASELESS LOGIC OF DREAM. (Henry Miller, 1947)[199]

In her definition of the experience of film viewing, Dorothy Richardson placed special emphasis on the spatial stillness of the spectator. We may recall her statement in Close Up that "the whole power of the film" rests in "the reduction, or elevation of the observer to the condition that is essential to perfect contemplation." To that she added: "The film, by setting the landscape in motion and keeping us still, allows it to walk through us. And what is true of the landscape is true of everything else that can be filmed."[200] The film spectator personifies for Richardson the stillness at Miriam's centre of being, the vast stillness toward which she grows in terms of her awareness and strength.

In Pilgrimage the still centre is manifest in physical forms which in their actual description need not necessarily demonstrate an absolute repose but only, in terms of the visual environment, a relative repose. The relationship reflects the contrasts specified by Richardson in Pilgrimage where she described, on the one hand, the "motionless unchanging centre of [the] consciousness" and, on the other, what she called, successively, the "ceaseless stream of events," the "ceaseless stream of inadequate commentary," the "ceaseless flow of events," and the "ceaseless exchange of unsatisfactory comments."[201] For example, someone riding, to a greater degree than someone walking, might emulate conditions like those surrounding the film spectator. Miriam is frustrated by the fragmentation of perception caused by walking: "she wished that the action of walking were not so jerky, that the expanses on either side might pass more smoothly and easily by; 'that's why people drive,' she thought; 'you can only really see the country when you are not moving yourself.'"[202] In riding a bicycle Miriam felt as if she was "sitting at rest:" "Lifted off the earth, sitting at rest in the moving air, the London air turning into fresh moving air flowing through your head, the green squares and high houses moving, sheering smoothly along, sailing towards you changed, upright, and alive, moving by speaking, telescoping away behind unforgotten, still visible, staying in your forward-looking eyes, being added to in unbroken movement."[203]

For Miriam a moving vehicle such as a bus, by being enclosed, may provide the means for increasing the sense of watching a movie on a screen in the "softly-gilded twilight" of a cinema theatre: "In the dimly lit little interior, moving along through the backward flowing mist-screened street lights, she . . . sat thoughtless, gazing inward along the bright kaleidoscopic vistas that came unfailing and unchanged whenever she was moving, alone and still, against the moving tide of London, . . . [gazing at vistas that were] the common possession of all who would be still."[204]

These excerpts show again that watching continuous visual imagery is virtually a way of life for Miriam. It is in the breaches or gaps or radical variations of the normally unbroken, often moving surfaces of the visible world, of the "cinematograph show" of life, that Miriam's moments of acute awareness of the stable, spiritual core of her real self occur. The film viewing experience provides the model for such breaches. In its depiction of "the moving panorama of life" film provides, Richardson said, "interiors, and interiors opening out of interiors."[205] Richardson spoke too of the "possibility of which any film is so delightfully prodigal: the possibility of escape via incidentals into the world of meditation or of thought."[206]

For Miriam, it may be the illuminating patch of light, identical at either end of any tunnel, which is a type of the breach in the normal woven continuity usually perceived by the "stationary" observer. Riding on one occasion in an omnibus, for example, Miriam feels as if she is in a tunnel: "The long corridor of London imprisoned her. . . . The irregular façades, dull greys absorbing the light, bright buffs throwing it brilliantly out, dadoed below with a patchwork of shops, and overhead the criss-cross of telephone wires, shut her away from the low-hung soft grey sky. But far away, unfailing, retreating as the long corridor telescoped towards them, an obliterating haze filled the vista holding her in her place."[207]

* * *

In the following pages of this study I have excerpted a number of illustrations evoking aspects of the ideal film viewing experience which Richardson described in _Close Up_. I have arranged them chronologically to reveal their use as a metaphor which informs the movement and the themes of the novel. The illustrations, not qualitatively unlike many of the ones I have already made reference to, are taken only from the last five volumes of _Pilgrimage_. The fifth-last of these is _Oberland_. In _Oberland_ Richardson has created an expanded time and space interval, or gap, or breach--in narrative terms, precisely a fortnight--which stands out from the broader continuum of Miriam's entire life. This interval has the quality of being a spatially and temporally enlarged visual model of the moments--particularly the special moments which occur subsequently to this interval--which dramatically mark out the final stages of Miriam's pilgrimage. It is this interval which, as has already been noted, is seen by Miriam as a "golden eternity," a "golden life within her life."

Oberland, characterized by an evenly-proportioned visual richness and directness which entirely eclipses any non-visual content it might contain, is a visual correlative for the vast strength, beauty, and unity which Miriam discovers, both there and more intensely later, within herself. Richardson uses visual techniques to show the infinity of outer spaces mirroring and being mirrored by Miriam's inner vastness. Miriam's sense of the great external spaces which seem to be deliberately identifying or collaborating with her in spirit reinforces her recognition and knowledge of her own inner strength. The sense of kinship, of collaboration, recalls that which Miriam saw between herself and her grandmother--"finding the same world in another person . . . makes you feel that you exist." For Miriam, a sense of kinship with place is often stronger than that with people, and in Oberland she finds a world which deeply reflects and reveals her own. Indeed, Oberland seems to express with Miriam "the same accepted astonishment" at existence as she does, as it defines and mirrors the nature of her own wholeness.

A train, "steaming off into the night,"[208] carries Miriam through the night-long tunnel of a "flaming darkness"[209] to the light at the end of the tunnel, a morning vision of "dawn-greyed snow-fields."[210] The vision, the "pictures framed and glazed,"[211] which Miriam sees through the window marks the beginning of the virtually continuous "motion-picture," the Oberland-interval, of the next 100 pages:

> The leap of recognition, unknowing between the mountains and herself which was which, made the first sight of them--smooth snow and crinkled rock in unheard-of unimagined tawny light--seem, even at the moment of seeing, already long ago.
>
> They knew, they smiled joyfully at the glad shock they were, sideways gigantically advancing while she passed as over a bridge across which presently there would be no return, seeing and unseeing, seeing again with the first keen vision.
>
> They closed in upon the train, summitless, their vases gliding by, a ceaseless tawny cliff throwing its light into the carriage, almost within touch; receding, making space at its side for sudden blue water, a river accompanying, giving them gentleness who were its mighty edge; broadening, broadening, becoming a wide lake, a stretch of smooth peerless blue with mountains reduced and distant upon its hither side. With the sideways climbing of the train the lake dropped away, down and down until presently she stood up to see it below in the distance, a blue pool amidst its encirclement of mountain and of sky: a picture sliding away, soundlessly, hopelessly demanding its perfect word.[212]

Fade-out.

This passage, marking Miriam's entry into the Oberland-stage of her pilgrimage, comprises one of the most striking visual sequences in the novel, a sequence evoking the sense of watching moving images on film. In concluding the passage the narrator ironically seems to consider momentarily, but in effect encompasses and dissolves, the impasse raised by the need to find words--to use the "masculine" mode--to convey something pictorial and spiritual and "feminine." The passage conveys pictorially not only the sense of a spiritual kinship between the observer and the observed environment, but also the sense of the environment's willing, collaborative response, acknowledging that Miriam spiritually is at one with it. In terms of technique and theme, the passage, like all of Oberland, anticipates other still more intense moments of Miriam's self-recognition and inner joy.

Tobogganing, which becomes the most popular past-time for Miriam at Oberland, has been repeatedly used by Richardson as a means of stressing the harmony between Miriam and the environment. The movement of the landscape--it "had flown with her and swooped up as she plunged"[213]--evokes the sense of the movement of surfaces projected on a film screen, with "sky and landscape sweeping upwards, mountains gigantically sweeping upwards to the movement of her downward rush."[214] The movement refines visual and other sensory experience by demanding attention exclusively for itself. The visual world takes on the quality of what Richardson saw as the ideal film screen which, she said, "should dominate . . . should fill the vista."[215] The experience brings Miriam a "joy of flight," a "singing joy of the inaccessible world to which in flight one was translated, bringing forgetfulness of everything but itself. Bend after bend appeared and of itself her body swayed now right now left in unconscious rhythm. The landscape flew by, sideways-upwards, its features indistinguishable. She was movement, increasing, cleaving the backward rushing air."[216]

Exhilirating experiences such as this make Oberland a catalyst and a confirmation by bringing to Miriam the assurance of her own reality. The Oberland-interval shows her the value of transcending the imprisonment and the superficiality and the frustration of a "fact-facing and circumstance-facing" existence. In the period of time after the Oberland-experience Miriam follows with a growing certainty of self "the light shining from the future over her earliest memories: revived in Oberland and now leaping forward regardless of the intervening years."[217] It is the same light shining at both ends of the tunnel of experience.

In Dawn's Left Hand Miriam, now back in London, makes a dramatic series of breaks from the worldly encumbrances which over the years had come to suppress the spirit of her inner life. First, she flees Flaxman's Court and the oppressive Selina Holland with whom she had lived for eighteen months. In recalling and evaluating the reason for her flight, Miriam says: "Only from Flaxman's did I fly, from enclosure in squalor I was powerless to mitigate; ready to agree with."[218] Also, in her love affair with Hypo, Miriam moves inwardly away from him and toward "life's infallible centre:"

> "I'm not here," she said abruptly as he bent towards her, and the sound of her voice went past him out into the dark spaces and left her . . . separated

> from him. . . .
>
> . . . Within her was something that stood apart, unpossessed. . . . [H]er spirit was making its own statement, profanely asserting the unattained being that was promising, however, faintly, to be presently the surer for this survival. Joining forces with it, using her will to banish the lingering images, she felt herself sink towards sleep.
>
> Drawing back the curtain from the open lattice, she found in the outside scene no escape from the lifelessness of the room. The garden; . . . expressionless.
>
> The world was changed. And perhaps this repellent bleakness was the truth lying beneath the bright surface she had mistaken for reality.
>
> Seeking refuge in imagined, distant scenes, she found their faces wan, and glanced with dismay along the endless years to be lived out in a dead world. But even dismay failed her, remained cold and lifeless, like the features of the room.
>
> At the edge of her circle of vision as she stood before the mirror with her arms raised to her head and eyes intent upon the shaping of her hair, birds appeared, three moving specks far off in the farther corner of the scene framed by the open window. Without shifting her gaze she saw them as they came forward downwards towards the centre of the sky. In the form of an elongated triangle they flashed by near at hand and disappeared beyond the window's nearer rim. And the sight of them as they passed had smitten through her as though she were transparent and left her thrilled from head to foot with the sense of having shared their swift and silent flight.
>
> And as surprised and as new as this vivid experience was the way she had taken it: noting it in passing and, while exultantly her consciousness declared that last night's lonely journey through uninhabited darkness had carried her into a way of being that would find its own responses in this dead-seeming world, going on doing her hair.[219]

The appearance within the double frame of mirror and window of the "elongated triangle" brings to mind Virginia Woolf's reaction to the shadow which appeared for a moment at one corner of the screen during a showing of the film, The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari. "For a moment it seemed," said Woolf, "as if thought could be conveyed by shape more effectively than by words." Richardson has used a visual rhetoric in the novel to communicate linguistically Miriam's subjective states in a manner which in its intent and effect matches Woolf's suggestion concerning the use of abstract shapes in film. The degree of actuality which accompanies deeply subjective and highly visual experiences such as Miriam's--her "sense of having shared [in the birds'] swift and silent flight"--is emphasized by her recollection, somewhat later that day, that "it was herself who this morning, ages ago, had been up with the birds in their sky."[220]

Soon after, near the conclusion of Miriam's visit at Hypo Wilson's home on the cliff, it was her ride in a tram which "hailed her . . . from within the self that was unknown to those in the house on the cliff." Richardson used this tram, like other vehicles in the novel, to imitate the conditions of film viewing in a cinema-theatre. The occasion marks a further step in the transformation of Miriam's awareness of herself: "Through the sliding door she escaped into the welcome of reflected light, into an inner world that changed the aspect of everything about her. When the tram moved off, the scenes framed by the windows grew beautiful in movement. The framing and the movement created them. . . . Watching them, she was out in eternity, gliding along, adding this hour to the strange sum of her central being."[221]

In Clear Horizon, the volume following Dawn's Left

Hand, Richardson again placed one of Miriam's fantastic and personal experiences into a continuous visual context where her attention is arrested by something suddenly "standing out" from the "cinematograph show" of her day-time environment. An "adventure in the sky"[222] during which she watches in wonder certain "vibrating particles of light"[223] overtakes her while she sits in a restaurant: "With a single up-swinging movement, she was clear of earth and hanging, suspended and motionless, high in the sky, looking, away to the right, into a far-off pearly-blue distance, that held her eyes, seeming to be in motion within itself: an intense crystalline vibration that seemed to be aware of being enchantedly observed, and even to be amused and to be saying, 'Yes, this is my reality.' She was moving, or the sky about her was moving."[224] The fact that for Miriam this moment is intensely actual is emphasized by her fear, later, that her telling others that she had been "up in the clouds" would be taken by them only as a metaphorical statement.[225] For Miriam, however, "it was the world of hard fact she had just visited."[226] The experience was as real, the narrator says, as other visual experiences--"as real as the crowded roadways converging within her sight as she looked through the window, as real as the calm grey church across the way and the group of poplars presiding over the cab-shelter."[227] In terms bringing to mind what we have already noted concerning the significance for Richardson of the film spectator as a still centre, the narrator sums up the moment, which is seen as "just a passing glimpse," as "movement that is perfect rest."[228]

Another visually-realized "glimpse" comes to Miriam when a "little phrase," as in Proust's Remembrance of Things Past, brings her the certainty that somewhere "her authentic being was plunged in a timeless reality within which . . . she might rejoin it:" "she drew back and back and caught a glimpse, through an opening inward eye, of a gap in a low hedge, between two dewy lawns, through which she could see the features of some forgotten scene, the last of a fading twilight upon the gloomy leaves of dark, clustered bushes and, further off, its friendly glimmer upon massive tree-trunks."[229] Pondering to herself why it seemed "that only garden scenes . . . returned of themselves without associative link or deliberate effort of memory,"[230] Miriam is led to the feeling that a "green solitude," an ultimate return to the "endless garden" of her first self, might yet be hers.[231] The forgotten scene in the gap of the hedge, like the visualized spatial gap or breach or interval of "reality" announcing itself from within the ceaseless "cinematograph show" of temporal events, thus foreshadows the great moment which I shall consider shortly, when Miriam finally finds herself as she also finds God.

Somewhat later in her room at Mrs. Bailey's, Miriam again experiences a retreat into a "film viewing" centre, into the changeless heart of her being. However the final anticipated revelation still does not come, but holds her in suspense: "Her being sank, perceptibly, back and back into a centre. . . . Turning gently in the midst of her recovered wealth, in the companionship that brought, even with movement, a deepening stillness, she saw upon the end wall the subdued reflection of London light, signalling the vast quiet movement of light about the world. It held a secret for whose full revelation she felt she could wait for ever, knowing that it would come."[232]

The opening of the next volume, Dimple Hill, marks the gateway to another interval of time--like the Oberland vacation, another period of rest for Miriam--away from Mrs. Bailey's and the Tansley Street office. Before actually proceeding to Dimple Hill, where she will stay with some Quaker people, Miriam goes to visit the Brooms, a visit which for Miriam represents externally a return to "the centre." In terms of the structure of the novel, it is a return which brings together the second-last volume, Dimple Hill, and the second volume, Backwater, for it was in Backwater, when Miriam was fifteen years younger, that her days with the Brooms, and at Wordsworth House, commenced. Only Grace Broom, thinks Miriam, "could embody so long a stretch of the past. All the years from Wordsworth House days onward lay embalmed in the treasure house of Grace's faithful memory."[233] Thankful for the detachment from the flow of current events which is facilitated for her by her return to the Broom's, she realizes that "in no other spot on earth could she so deeply savour the bouquet of her release."[234] On the first morning of her visit Miriam feels fully "the bliss of escape" from external concerns: "when in the morning, as she stood, ready to go downstairs, before the wide mirror in which hitherto had been reflected her image entangled with a thousand undetachable associations, she saw only her solitary self, there had come that all-transfiguring moment during which in the depth of her being she had parted company with that self, masquerading under various guises, with whom she had gone about ever since leaving home, and joined company with the self she had known long ago."[235]

The mirror has been used by Richardson here again to provide the breach which allows Miriam to see beyond the surface rhythms of the self. In the mirror, not only does Miriam see herself, but, as if in confirmation of the validity of her detached oneness and uniqueness, she is seen. Like the sign of recognition in the encircling mountains of Oberland, and in the crystalline vibration in the sky, this recognition reaffirms for Miriam the fact of her being a motionless, unchanging centre, unchanged, indeed, from the self she had actually known long ago. The experience is like the return to the spot of light at the end, or beginning, of a tunnel. It recalls the vaguelyformulated realization she had years before in The Tunnel, about life's being a "walking backwards to something you know is there. However far you go out, you come back."[236]

The experience in front of the mirror, in terms of its relation to the window/film-screen motif, is the culmination of the many occasions when light and movement seen through windows or other openings bring to Miriam a sense which foreshadows her full awareness of the reality of her inner being. Richardson's description of the ideal film viewing experience provides, as it were, a commentary upon Miriam's moment of realization before the mirror. Having stated, as we have already noted, that in her opinion one of the great potentialities of film is that of "being a mirror for the customary and restoring its essential quality," she added: "is this so obvious mirror-focus quality a point worth insisting upon? . . . I believe it is immensely worth making and insisting upon. I believe that mirroring the customary and restoring its essential quality is and remains the film's utmost."[237]

Only a few pages after the experience before the mirror, Miriam receives ultimate confirmation of her inner reality and completeness. Having seen a window-framed view of a group of trees, a view giving rise to tears and the feeling that "for the first time since childhood she was alone with summer trees," Miriam decides to enter amongst them and read a book. A familiar quotation, appearing unexpectedly upon the page of her book, shocks her body physically, so that she looks up at the trees. Her looking up leads to an experience which is a visual, and spiritual, close-up making a breach in the cinematograph show before her:

> she found herself looking up to take astonished counsel with her forgotten surroundings and discovered, upon the upper foliage of a group of trees in the dense mass at the far end of the ridge, a patch of bright colour in a golden light so vivid that for a moment she seemed to discern, as if they were quite near, each of the varnished leaves. Risen to her feet, she found the radiant patch more distant and less bright, a small spash of brilliant colour such as she had seen a thousand times before, picked out from a spread of dark tree-tops by a ray of haze-screened, shadowless sunlight. But the rapture that had seized and filled her emptied being at the first sight of it still throbbed to and fro between herself and that far point upon the ridge, and still she felt the sudden challenge of that near, clear vision, like a signal calling for response; and like a smile, of amusement over her surprise.
>
> "I know," she heard herself exclaim towards the outspread scene whose grey light could no longer deceive. "At last I know! I have seen the smile of God. Sly smile." [S]he . . . looked . . . into her mind and found there, bathed in its full light, the far-off forgotten world from which she had fled and, with a last glance at the sunlit trees, turned to run and seek it there.[238]

This moment marks the mystical unifying of "seer and seen."[239] Miriam sees what she takes to be the smile of God; and God in return smiles, it appears to Miriam, an acknowledgement of their kinship. God's smile, revealed to Miriam in the patch of brilliant colour, gives her the perfect inner perception of herself, which is the culmination of her pilgrimage. It is the moment of Miriam's visually-celebrated return to her essential self. The evocative power of the visual imagery lets the reader, too, grasp the essence of

Miriam's moment of complete spiritual insight.

Miriam's return to the essence of the "green solitude" of her childhood's "summer trees" releases her from the pressures of false, intermediate positions she had taken in life, and restores to her a clarity of vision which gives her a basis upon which to become a writer. Ironically enough, it is Hypo's earlier statement about juxtaposed fragments of thought which now proves prophetic for Miriam: "You want a green solitude. An infant. Then you'd be able to write a book."[240] While Hypo's words had much earlier evoked within her a vision of "a little house whose little garden should lead down into a wood," Miriam nevertheless had at that time reacted to his prediction with disbelief: "Tree-trunks, in woodland variety, standing in light dimmed by their full-leaved branches, came before her inward eye, and the London fever in her blood longed for the touch of the moist, deep air called up by his words. . . . But the words settled in her mind, the promise of a bourne to which she could see no possible path."[241] However, by the end of Pilgrimage, and after her having experienced the series of events, the model for which may be found in Richardson's interpretation of the experience of the film spectator, Miriam feels the freedom she now has to contemplate her past with insight and detachment. Miriam states on the second-last page of the novel: "While I write, everything vanishes but what I contemplate. The whole of what is called 'the past' is with me, seen anew, vividly. . . . Contemplation is adventure into discovery; reality."[242] As if in final fulfillment of Hypo's prophetic linking of green solitude, an infant, and Miriam's writing a book, and in confirmation of Miriam's own capturing of her childhood vision, the novel closes with Miriam's recollection of her inward peace at holding the infant son of Amabel, her best friend: "Freedom. Often I had held babies in my arms: . . . But never with that sense of perfect serenity."[243]

PART THREE

WYNDHAM LEWIS'S LITERARY EXPLORATIONS:

THE PARODYING OF CINEMA

IN MODERN LITERATURE THERE IS PROBABLY NO MORE CELEBRATED TECHNIQUE THAN THAT OF THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS OR INTERIOR MONOLOGUE. WHETHER IN PROUST, JOYCE, OR ELIOT, THIS FORM OF SEQUENCE PERMITS THE READER AN EXTRAORDINARY IDENTIFICATION WITH PERSONALITIES OF THE UTMOST RANGE AND DIVERSITY. THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS IS REALLY MANAGED BY THE TRANSFER OF FILM TECHNIQUE TO THE PRINTED PAGE, WHERE, IN A DEEP SENSE IT REALLY ORIGINATED: FOR . . . THE GUTENBERG TECHNOLOGY OF MOVABLE TYPES IS QUITE INDISPENSABLE TO ANY INDUSTRIAL OR FILM PROCESS. AS MUCH AS THE INFINITESIMAL CALCULUS THAT PRETENDS TO DEAL WITH MOTION AND CHANGE BY MINUTE FRAGMENTATION, THE FILM DOES SO BY MAKING MOTION AND CHANGE INTO A SERIES OF STATIC SHOTS. PRINT DOES LIKEWISE WHILE PRETENDING TO DEAL WITH THE WHOLE MIND IN ACTION. YET FILM AND THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS ALIKE SEEMED TO PROVIDE A DEEPLY DESIRED RELEASE FROM THE MECHANICAL WORLD OF INCREASING STANDARDIZATION AND UNIFORMITY. NOBODY EVER FELT OPPRESSED BY THE MONOTONY OR UNIFORMITY OF THE CHAPLIN BALLET OR BY THE MONOTONOUS, UNIFORM MUSINGS OF HIS LITERARY TWIN, LEOPOLD BLOOM.

IN 1911 HENRI BERGSON IN CREATIVE EVOLUTION CREATED A SENSATION BY ASSOCIATING THE THOUGHT PROCESS WITH THE FORM OF THE MOVIE. JUST AT THE EXTREME POINT OF MECHANIZATION REPRESENTED BY THE FACTORY, THE FILM, AND THE PRESS, MEN SEEMED BY THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS, OR INTERIOR FILM TO OBTAIN RELEASE INTO A WORLD OF SPONTANEITY, OF DREAMS, AND OF UNIQUE PERSONAL EXPERIENCE. (Marshall McLuhan, 1964)[1]

THE CINEMA HAS AT LEAST ONE POSITIVE VIRTUE. IT SHOWS US HOW WE MUST NOT WRITE, DENOUNCES THE DEBASED TRICKERY AND SENSATIONALISM OF THOSE WHO IMITATE ITS METHODS ON THE WRITTEN PAGE, UNROLLING BEFORE OUR EYES A TAPE OF IMAGES AND PEDANTIC DESCRIPTIONS NOW IN CLOSE-UP, NOW FROM A DISTANCE, NOW IN TRUCKING SHOTS, BREAKING OFF WITH A QUICK FADE-OUT. . . . (Elémire Zolla, 1968)[2]

A. WYNDHAM LEWIS: THE WORLD OF CINEMA

BUT FIRST THERE WAS THE CINEMA. BEGIN WITH THAT. (Wyndham Lewis, 1930)[3]

In his fiction and polemical work Wyndham Lewis made innumerable references to specific aspects of what might be called the world of cinema, references to film personalities, individual films, or film techniques. These references, while they contribute to the metaphorical quality of Lewis's attitude toward the film medium, first of all point to Lewis's general knowledge and apt use of contemporary symbols. Behind this wide range of specific references lay a recognition, to be noted in more detail shortly, of the artistry of a small number of films. In these films Lewis saw that the medium had a potential for art as he defined it: "All forms of art [including what Lewis referred to here as the "film-play"] of a permanent order are intended not only to please and to excite, . . . but to call into play the entire human capacity--for sensation, reflection, imagination, and will. We judge a work of art, ultimately, with reference to its capacity to effect this total mobilization of our faculties."[4]

However, most of Lewis's specific references to film, unlike those of Dorothy Richardson, are not concerned with the function of art. Lewis was primarily concerned with the function of the medium itself and the implications of its use as a model for perception and as a tool. The popular film seemed to him to illustrate what he saw as a vulgarized use of the medium, a manipulation of new technology for debased and debasing ends. He was particularly concerned, too, with the effect of what he called "the instruments of research," of new media, and new techniques, on philosophy and speculative thought.[5] His references to specific aspects of the world of cinema take on the attributes of a many-faceted, comprehensively vast, composite metaphor associated with a loss of common sense values and a consequent loss of meaning in both art and life.

Although I intend in my concentration on Lewis to explore in some detail the meaning of this metaphor, its application by Lewis to contemporary fiction, and its operation in his own fiction, I shall first look briefly at his actual familiarity with the world of film and some of his references to it.

For the early Chaplin films, Lewis always expressed some measure of admiration. Indeed his enjoyment of American movies was restricted entirely to these productions. Lewis stated in _The Lion and the Fox_ (1927) that Chaplin was "the only creative personality that the cinema [had] produced for itself (coming in its first days, before superproduction changed, in standardizing it, the character of the screen play)."[6] Similarly, in Time and Western Man (1927), while discussing Chaplin's 1914 movies with "the Keystone giants," Lewis stated that Charlie Chaplin was for him "the greatest screen artist."[7] William C. Wees, in his book, Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde (1972), has provided a chatty account of a pre-war afternoon which Lewis spent at a London cinema: "Rather than an Omega 'evening' for wealthy customers and patrons, Lewis would choose, unhesitatingly, an afternoon in a little flea-pit cinema at the bottom of Charlotte Street, where children went for tuppence to see, among other things, Charlie Chaplin one-reelers. This was before anyone talked about Chaplin, but Lewis discovered him there. 'Come and see a clown,' he said to Helen Rowe one day, and took her to sit among the children and marvel at an actor who understood that mannerisms not only disguise, but have the power to take on lives of their own."[8]

Lewis's unabashed reception of what he called "that celebrated film-tramp"[9] did not preclude, it must be noted, his subsequent criticism of the popular reception of Chaplin films throughout the world. Imputing to mass-man an inability to discern and evaluate the popular contemporary trends, Lewis judged harshly the world-spirit which animated and supported Chaplin, and which gave Chaplin as well as other film personalities a prominent and sentimental place in a new mythology. Since he saw Chaplin become as it were both the symbol and sympton of the mind of the age, he included him in his criticism of the age. Lewis's censure of the current idolatry of a wide array of actual and fictional characters who, he maintained, reinforced or represented the age, a youth-worshipping age obsessed with "time," led him to devise what at first sight seems a most astonishing and unlikely configuration of characters--the "association of Einstein with Miss Stein, of Swann and Stein, of Bergson and Bloom, of Miss Loos, Charlie Chaplin and Whitehead."[10]

It was particularly because of Chaplin's function as an extension of what Lewis identified as the fashionable child-cult that Lewis linked him with the other figures, especially with Gertrude Stein. In the Doom of Youth (1932) Lewis similarly connected the "childishness of Charlie Chaplin--the little, down-trodden child-man" not only with the "thunderous deliberate naiveté" of Stein, but also with the "child-art" of the German painter, Paul Klee.[11] The presence in Lewis's fiction of Chaplin as child-man, whether it is made explicit or left implicit, colours much of Lewis's fiction.

The Chaplin-image is evoked repeatedly, for example, in The Childermass. The Bailiff, wishing to give the sensation-seeking public its favourite show, and himself operating within a physical atmosphere whose laws might be said to resemble those of the film medium, suddenly is metamorphosized into a film close-up, "a greatly enlarged mask of Chaplin."[12] The atmospheric conditions in the narrative also affect Satters, whose mode of walking becomes a record of the famous Chaplin shuffle:

> Satters flings his feet out, supposing each yard twice as spacious as it is. So for him his foot always comes down too soon or falls short;[13]
>
> Satters starts off badly, striking his feet down all over the place, but after a trial or two he finds his sea-legs and develops a gait of his own which is manfully rachitic, if at first absurdly arrogant;[14]
>
> the pleased Satters creeps forward, . . . kicking out his feet at stones and things with rebellious absent-mindedness, his eyes dutifully lowered, craftily side-glancing.[15]

In The Apes of God Charlie Chaplin's shuffle is again recalled in Lewis's depiction of Matthew Plunkett: "Matthew thrust his hands brutally into his trouser-pockets and assumed an expression of aggressive imbecility, half scowling tramp-comedian, half baby-boy. It was a rhythmic tramp-tramp-tramp, with every third step or so a stumble, that took him to the end of the square."[16] In this novel there is also Archie Margolin's "gesture of Charlot-triste--biting a lip,"[17] and the "Charlie Chaplin moustache"[18] of Isabel Kein's unnamed confidante.

For Lewis as for many other writers Hollywood was the blight in the world of film making. He saw Hollywood as the world's dream-factory, turning out products which were commercially saleable but artistically vulgar: "there is a worse thing than no art at all (no manner, no style)," Lewis said, "the saccharine travesty of art, namely, of the kind supplied by the Hollywood magnate."[19] Lewis, too, deplored the decisive role of economics in the production of films: "If we turn to [the art of] the cinema, we have at once a kind of creation which is fabulously expensive, right from the start. I refer, of course, to what is, for the cinematograph, the same as paper or canvas for the painter--namely celluloid. There is no more expensive basic material for an expressive art in the world. I once listened to Mr. Grierson, king of documentaries, expounding the economic problems confronting any man who used the cinematograph camera. I was amazed and horrified to learn what it cost to produce even a short documentary film."[20] Lewis concluded: "the celluloid is so fabulously expensive that only the films of the vulgarest type can be undertaken in Hollywood."[21] In the purgatory cum welfare state of Monstre Gai (1955) the citizens are deliberately bred upon the Hollywood product. The Bailiff explains to Pullman: "Lucifer and his subjects are tremendously 'liberalised', as it is called. They have pictures from Hollywood in their cinemas, and the Devil sometimes smokes a pipe."[22]

Lewis placed tiresome English films, and many continental films made by the underlings of Hollywood, in a category with the Hollywood movies. Such films only drew, he said, upon audiences whom he variously called the "box-office gulls,"[23] the "robot-rabble,"[24] and the "gum-chewing World-pit."[25] Reporting on the manoeuvres of a Hollywood-styled French film crew in the Moroccan desert, Lewis described the film maker as one who goes about "throwing up shoddy mirages, with his photographic sausage-machine, of the desert-life--so falsely-selected as to astonish into suspicion sometimes even the tamest Robot."[26] Lewis concluded scornfully: "this mechanical Vandal degrades . . . . everything he touches."[27]

Of English films specifically Lewis wrote in The Mysterious Mr. Bull (1938): "The cinema audience [of England] . . . is provided with a fare that is of so studiously 'low-brow' a nature, that often crises of inattention or boredom occur, the public absents itself, and this necessitates a readjustment of programmes, with a pinch more reality to rope them in again. (Compare an Anglo-Saxon film with a French or German one, and you will see at once what I mean.)"[28]

Lewis's reference in 1938 to the contrast between what he called Anglo-Saxon films and the serious films of France and Germany, as well as those of Russia, represented the typical opinion of many artists during the preceding two decades. The usual point of contrast for Lewis lay between the technically efficient but artistically deficient movies of Hollywood and the aesthetically interesting films of these three European countries. This contrast emerges, for example, in America and Cosmic Man (1948), where Lewis discussed the quality of American radio programs. "The American radio is as good," he wrote, "as the American movies are bad."[29] He then pointed out that "you have to go to the French cinema, or the German or Russian, to match the wonderful life, resourcefulness, intelligence of some American [radio] productions."[30] Lewis's feelings are reiterated by the characters of his fiction. In Self Condemned (1954), for example, René Harding and his wife find that "Momaco was a city without a theatre. It had the regulation number of cinemas; but these ran the repulsive average Hollywood Film, and were of no use to the Hardings. No French, Russian, German film was ever shown anywhere."[31]

Lewis's references to specific films and film personalities, as well as his references to Chaplin, form part of his system of symbols representing the age. A sense of the everyday presentness of the cinema is conveyed, for example, by the quite casual inclusion of references in his fiction to the "Sovkino Films"[32] or to "the latest Ealing Studios films."[33] Among important European movies which function briefly as contemporary symbols in Lewis's work are: The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari,[34] Metropolis,[35] and The Battleship Potemkin.[36]

Like Chaplin, the Keystones became the prototypes for Satters in The Childermass. When Pullman cracks Satters on the head, Satters' response recalls the sense of precise comic timing of action in the slapstick films of the silent era: "Satters as Keystone giant receives the crack exactly in the right spot, he sags forward in obedient overthrow, true to type--as though after a hundred rehearsals, true to a second--and crashes to earth as expected, rolling up a glazed eyeball galore, the correct classical Keystone corpse of Jack-the-Giantkiller comedy. Pullman gazes down through his glasses at the prostrate enemy while the camera could click out a hundred revolutions."[37] Lewis's description is an excellent example of the way in which cinema images have inspired the writer's creative imagination.

Marx Brothers comedies, in their highlighting of the chaotic element in life, are also briefly part of the film-landscape of Lewis's work. For example, while discussing European politics in Blasting and Bombardiering (1937), Lewis described what was happening as "the true Harpo technique. Everyone at everyone else's throat, just the way things happen in a Marx Brothers film, with Harpo at the heart of the mischief. No one knows if they're standing on their heads or their heels any longer."[38] In Snooty Baronet (1932) the bewildering confusion in a crowd is, Lewis wrote, "like a football scrum in a Marx Brothers pantomime."[39]

Clark Gable provided another contemporary point of reference in Lewis's system of symbols. Clark Gable's smile, his touch, his growl constitute some of the frequently recurring "Clarkly" images in Lewis's fiction, especially in The Revenge for Love (1937). Gable is given top billing in the fantasy world of Margot, who filters her idea of her husband, Victor Stamp, through the screen image of Clark Gable: "Victor is her private screen star really."[40] In The Vulgar Streak (1941) Vincent Penhale takes on the attributes of the fashionable god by wearing "a twisted Clark Gable sugary smile of such deliberate, almost sickly, pathos."[41]

In The Hitler Cult (1939) there are direct allusions to Clark Gable, Charlie Chaplin, Adolph Zukor, and Emil Jannings.[42] The religion, Hitlerism, Lewis said, was making existence for Berliners of the thirties seem "like a never-ending film of The Life of Adolf Hitler."[43] In Hitler (1931) he spoke of "the political cinema unrolling itself in the German Capital, with many a hefty start and flick."[44] He described Goering as having "looked rather like a sheriff in a cowboy film."[45] Lewis's references to film suggest that he was aware of the subliminal effects of the new medium on the consciousness of the viewers. The mechanical unrolling of movie-reels was beginning to reify and to accommodate the concept of the inevitability of historical process by providing an easily accessible metaphor for the Zeitgeist. Lewis also saw that the film producers as mythmakers were providing what might be dangerously simplified images for the projection and interpretation of reality.

Lewis frequently employed a rhetoric in his fiction which parodied the mechanics of actual film images, especially the close-up. For example, in *The Apes of God* when Matthew Plunkett goes through the motions of embracing Betty Bligh, the "adult-tot," she sees him as if she were watching a film. His lips approach hers in "portentous slow-movement of gruelling close-up."[46] The film close-up usually implies unpleasantness--like the "juicy close-up"[47] of Val in *Snooty Baronet*--or often sensationalism involving, for example, brutality. In *Self Condemned* the horrors of the World Wars are seen by René Harding as "the frightful close-up of typical History which we have all had during the past twenty or thirty years."[48] In *Time and Western Man* Lewis used the concept of the close-up--sensational and immediate--to define the anti-intellectual nature of the work of the advertiser or hypnotist, who seeks to shock the individual out of a sense of past and future: "the essence of this living-in-the-moment and for-the-moment--of submission to a giant hyperbolic close-up of a moment--is . . . to banish all *individual* continuity. You must, for a perfect response to this instantaneous suggestion, be *the perfect sensationalist*."[49]

B. TWENTIETH-CENTURY WAYS OF SEEING (1): WYNDHAM LEWIS

> IMMEDIACY, AWARENESS THAT DOES NOT FORM A SYNTHESIS WITH REALITY AND REALITY THAT DOES NOT FORM A SYNTHESIS WITH AWARENESS: SUCH IS THE FALSELY PARADISIAC STATE THAT THE CINEMA OFFERS AND CONFIRMS. THE MASS-MAN IS RIGHT WHEN HE REJECTS AVANT-GARDE LITERATURE AND ACCEPTS THE CINEMA, SO CLOSE TO EACH OTHER IN SPIRIT. HE DOES NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THOSE ATTEMPTS AT MOVIEMAKING WHICH ARE THE PAGES OF JOYCE, WHERE EVERYTHING OVERLAPS AMBIGUOUSLY, SINCE IT IS ABSURD TO WANT TO DESTROY WORDS BY MEANS OF WORDS; WHEREAS THE SUPERIMPOSITION OF THE IMAGES OF A FATALLY WOUNDED MAN, A WALTZ PLAYED BY A PIANOLA, AND THE PERHAPS LEERING OR STUPEFIED FACE OF AN ASSASSIN COMMUNICATES DIRECTLY (YET DOES NOT EXPRESS) THE STATE OF PARALYSIS IN WHICH THE MASS-MAN LIVES OUT HIS EXISTENCE. (Elémire Zolla, 1968)[50]

Wyndham Lewis's explorations of media began with a violent, avant-garde, pre-war celebration of the possibilities for media developments and changes, and moved to more sober assessments of the situation in the 1920's. In the post-war world, a media-assaulted world reeling from the effects of technological changes which were creating an alien environment in terms of man's perception and experience, Lewis came to see his role as that of "a sort of public bodyguard."[51]

In June 1914 the first of two editions of *Blast*, edited by Lewis, appeared.[52] The contents of *Blast* featured a joyful series of declarations "blasting" establishment values and symbols, like, the "years 1837 to 1900," and "blessing" symbols which for Lewis could be associated with "an awakening of the emotions of artistic sensibility."[53] In recalling this period of Putsches and manifestoes Lewis has written in Blasting and Bombardiering: "At some time during the six months that preceded the declaration of war, very suddenly, from a position of relative obscurity, I became extremely well-known. Roughly this period coincides with the publication of Blast. I can remember no specific morning upon which I woke and found that this had happened. But by August 1914 no newspaper was complete without news about 'vorticism' and its arch-exponent Mr. Lewis."[54]

It is the external appearance of Blast, as astonishing as the literary style and content of the manifestoes, which for this study is particularly interesting. Physically and typographically, in terms of size as well as design, the periodical was an experiment in the uses of a medium: "With a page-area of 12 inches by 9½, this publication was of a bright puce colour," Lewis wrote. "In general appearance it was not unlike a telephone book."[55] What Lewis showed by his production of Blast was a fascination with new forms of a given medium, forms which were self-exploratory in terms of the uses and impact of the medium, forms which affected readers' sensibilities in terms of the actual presence and power of what was until then the traditional medium of print. Lewis's own sensitivity to the potency of media-metamorphoses and to the effect of the presence of new media is what gave depth to his insights into film, which he identified more in terms of its continuous presence as a communication medium than in terms of its presence as a story-telling mechanism.

The first version of Lewis's The Enemy of the Stars appeared, as has already been mentioned, in the first issue of Blast. As one literary critic, E. W. F. Tomlin, has stated, this piece "would make an admirable surrealist film."[56] Lewis described the "play" as being an attempt to lead the way toward a literary abstraction which would keep pace with the visual revolution in painting: "My literary contemporaries I looked upon as too bookish and not keeping pace with the visual revolution. A kind of play, 'The Enemy of the Stars' . . . was my attempt to show them the way. It became evident to me at once, however, when I started to write a novel, that words and syntax were not susceptible of transformation into abstract terms, to which process the visual arts lent themselves quite readily. The coming of war and the writing--at top-speed--of a full-length novel ("Tarr") was the turning-point. Writing--literature--dragged me out of the abstractist cul-de-sac."[57]

The Enemy of the Stars, the literary mode of which Lewis came to reject, was, he suggested, probably "responsible for the manner here and there of Joyce's book,"[58] Ulysses. It is interesting to note that Tomlin has seen in the manner of The Childermass, too, an extension of The Enemy of the Stars. Indeed, Tomlin has suggested that the dramatic and incandescent quality of vision which he has found in The Enemy of the Stars "attained its apogee in Childermass."[59] While Tomlin's suggestion carries a face-value validity, it does not point out that The Childermass is essentially a parody of the "cinematic," mentalist environment of Ulysses, and hence a parody even of The Enemy of the Stars.

The first edition of the novel, Tarr (1918),[60] was written in the period, 1914-1915. It had, said Lewis in Rude Assignment, an "abruptness and for that time a new directness, . . . [a] strong visual notation. . . ."[61] In 1953 he wrote about the novel in a letter to Hugh Kenner: "In Tarr (1914-15) I was an extremist. . . . In writing Tarr I wanted at the same time for it to be a novel, and to do a piece of writing worthy of the hand of the abstractist innovator (which was an impossible combination). Anyhow it was my object to eliminate anything less essential than a noun or a verb. Prepositions, pronouns, article--the small fry--as far as might be, I would abolish. Of course I was unable to do this,but for the purposes of the novel, I produced a somewhat jagged prose."[62]

In his turning from innovative abstractionism in his early work to a severe questioning of the abstractionist literary mode in his work of the late 1920's, Lewis moved toward attempts at a reconciliation of extremes rather than an elevation of one extreme. In moving away from what he came to call a "pretentious intellectualist abstraction,"[63] Lewis tried to avoid a visual mode which would appeal solely to the isolated eye of the reader--an appeal taking on what Lewis thought of as the sensory vagueness of music--and which at the same time ignored the intellect and the imagination. Lewis's discussion of his attitude toward painting in the _Demon of Progress in the Arts_ (1954) acts as a guide to an understanding of his eventual preference in literature for what was both visually _and_ intellectually concrete rather than what was solely visual and hence abstract: "I saw that it was irrational to attempt to transmute the art of painting into music--to substitute for the most naturally concrete of the arts the most inevitably abstract. So of course I recovered my reason. This did not mean that I abandoned a twentieth-century way of seeing. I escaped--that was all--from reaching a point, very soon, where I should have ceased to be a _visual_ artist at all."[64]

C. TWENTIETH-CENTURY WAYS OF SEEING (2): TECHNOLOGICAL MAN

THE LIFE SWALLOWED BY THE MACHINES IS THERE, IN THOSE TAPEWORMS, I MEAN IN THE FILMS, NOW COILED ON THEIR REELS.

WE HAVE TO FIX THIS LIFE, WHICH HAS CEASED TO BE LIFE, SO THAT ANOTHER MACHINE MAY RESTORE TO IT THE MOVEMENT HERE SUSPENDED IN A SERIES OF INSTANTANEOUS SECTIONS.

WE ARE AS IT WERE IN A WOMB, IN WHICH IS DEVELOPING AND TAKING SHAPE A MONSTROUS MECHANICAL BIRTH. (Luigi Pirandello, 1916)[65]

In retrospective considerations of the period during which he had begun to write, Wyndham Lewis saw increasingly the extent to which an age had been embracing changes, such as media developments, had precipitated a joyous madness among both artists and the masses, a madness which should be interpreted as a real madness.

After the war the masses had become the uncritical heir to what they were invited to consider as the benefits of the media explosion which had taken place at the beginning of the century. In words provided by Harding in Self Condemned, the period between 1914-1918 had been "the giant backcloth for a new Year One."[66] "The great development of the radio, the cinematograph, and the telephone all can be integrated in this almost mystical barrier"[67] between pre-war and post-war years, Lewis observed much later in The Writer and the Absolute (1952), as a year earlier in Rotting Hill he had written: "In 1900 the bee was in the clover. God was in His Heaven, all was well with the world. Fifty years ago the scene was amazingly different. The radio, the automobile, the airship and airplane, the telephone, television, the cinema--these revolutionary techniques did not come one at a time with decent intervals in between. Four decades absorbed this stupendous cataract."[68]

The wide-spread presence of media and of fast transportation was creating, Lewis saw, a "global village:" "the earth has become one big village, with telephones laid on from one end to the other, and air transport, both speedy and safe."[69] Lewis was generally pessimistic about the world-wide levelling influence of the media as they produced an externally uniform and common world culture. Individual perception and hence imaginative expression were easily eradicated, he thought, by the onslaught of technological progress. "Everywhere the peoples become more and more alive," Lewis wrote in Time and Western Man. "Local colours, which have endured in many places for two thousand years, fade so quickly that already one uniform grey tint has supervened. The astonishing advances in applied science and in industrial technique made this inevitable."[70] Lewis repeatedly imputed to the cinema a central role in this drama of universal subjugation: "The great technical inventions--wireless, the petrol-engine, the cinema--affect radically the life of everybody."[71] Writing in Paleface

(1929) Lewis paid special attention to the role of the cinema as leveller: "It is not disputed by anybody that we have evolved a very mechanical type of life, as a result of the discovery of printing and its child, the Press--the Cinema, Radio and so forth, and the immense advances in the technique of Industry. There is much less differentiation now, that is, between the consciousness of the respective members of a geographical group, and between the various groups of peoples, than before machines made it possible for everyone to mould their mind upon the same cultural model (in the way that they all subject themselves to the emotional teaching of a series of films, for instance, all over the surface of the globe)."[72] In Rude Assignment Lewis described how television, too, will affect people "scientific techniques have so diminished distance, and telescoped time, that the earth, which once was for man an immense, mysterious, and seemingly limitless universe, is no longer that, but a relatively diminutive ball, which, if we want to, we can dart around in a few days. The people living on it are rapidly standardised--are no longer 'mysterious', any more than is their habitat. And tomorrow television will enable us, by the mere pressing of a button, to be in the West Indies, among sugar canes and Fife bananas, or in Greenland enjoying the solitary life of the Eskimo, in an icebound landscape."[73]

On one level the media, simply by virtue of their presence, were affecting the lives of every individual in much the same way, Lewis wrote in 1922, as "the shapes of the objects (houses, cars, dresses and so forth) by which they are surrounded have a very profound effect on people."[74] In another sense, controls could easily be established, and were established, to deliberately manipulate the responses of the masses. The world could be easily paralyzed by the mesmerizing effect of the media: "democratic masses could be governed without a hitch by suggestion and hypnotism--Press, Wireless, Cinema. So what need is there . . . to slaughter them?"[75]

Governing by means of mass hypnotism might involve, said Lewis, the use of "film-plays" and other methods in "bringing about such a state of mind as is desired by the political interests financing those activities."[76] At the same time it might involve what at first sight appear to be less ostensibly political factors than factors reflecting simply the interests of the lowest cultural level of society: "whether openly or covertly, it is Press and Cinema hypnotism that rules Great Britain and America, not the conversazione at Westminster or the White House. But the spell-bound Public, at the hands of the popular press or by way of the film, has notions and beliefs pumped into it that are the reverse of any recognized Tradition--whether in Religion, Law, Government, or Ethics. . . . [I]f I have an objection at all to these principles of indirect government in the democratic West, it is because, although revolutionary, it is purely destructive: and being 'democratic' it is destructive of what the lowest average 'low-brow' Homme moyen sensual is disposed to hate and to destroy."[77]

The entire tone of Lewis's general assessment of the influence of the cinema contrasts strongly with Dorothy Richardson's readiness to grant the cinema the opportunity not only to prove itself but also to enrich the other arts. A broad set of differences in disposition and preferences distinguishes in many ways the sustained gentleness of Richardson's approach from Lewis's critical attitude after the first World War. None of Richardson's enthusiasm characterizes the spirit of Lewis's statement about cinema in The Art of Being Ruled (1926): "you must follow the golden rule, namely: You cannot aim too low. The story you present cannot be too stupid. . . . In general it can be said that no confidence trick is too transparent to dupe [the Public] with; no picture of life is too unreal or sugary for their taste."[78] It was during the following year that Dorothy Richardson began writing her series of essays on the cinema.

D. COMMON-SENSE PERCEPTION VERSUS THE ISOLATION OF THE CAMERA EYE

IN DREAMS . . . THE EYE IS IN EVERY WAY SUPREME. OUR DREAMS ARE SO MUFFLED . . . THAT THEY ARE NEARLY AS SILENT AS THE KINEMA. . . . DREAMS ARE AN EXAMPLE OF SENSATIONS EVOLVED, WITH GREAT COMPLEXITY, IN A NEW ORDER, AND WITH NEW EMOTIONAL STRESSES AND JUXTAPOSITIONS. . . . BUT THE WORK OF ART DOES THE RE-ORDERING IN THE INTERESTS OF THE INTELLECT AS WELL AS OF THE EMOTIONS. (Wyndham Lewis, 1922)[79]

The cinema and the stream-of-consciousness novel--or "the stream of unconsciousness" novel as he called it[80]--brought together, by what Wyndham Lewis saw as shared, a number of negative characteristics of central importance in his philosophical analyses of contemporary life. Both projected a dream-world. Both stressed the value of the irrational as opposed to the rational, time as opposed to space, fragmented as opposed to comprehensive perception, flux as opposed to stability. Both narrowed subjective interpretation to abstract mentalism or confined sensualism. Neither broadened interpretation to encompass views based on the complementary functioning of all the senses and intellect. Lewis favoured, he said, the "classical" approach to art. The "romantic" approach prevailed.[81]

Using another set of terms to discuss what was substantially an extension of the classic-romantic dichotomy, Lewis said that he preferred what he called the "common-sense" rather than the "isolated sense" approach to things. The former of these two terms refers to a comprehensive as opposed to a particularized view of life. Together the terms raise the main issue in Lewis's attitude toward the film as medium. Film, Lewis felt, facilitates a particularized perception, a particularized view of life. It extended a manner of assessment begun by the camera in the nineteenth century.

Lewis did consider the visual sense, the sense to which cinema makes its primary appeal, to be the most important sense, particularly in contrast to hearing or touch. In his articulation of his "philosophy of the eye" in _Time and Western Man_, Lewis explained his preference for the visual sense: "If by 'philosophy of the eye' is meant that we wish to repose, and materially to repose, in the crowning human sense, the visual sense; and if it meant that we _refuse_ . . . to retire into the abstraction and darkness of an aural and tactile world, then it is true that our philosophy attaches itself to the concrete and radiant reality of the optic sense. That sensation of overwhelming _reality_ which vision alone gives is the reality of 'common-sense,' as it is the reality we inherit from pagan antiquity."[82]

Lewis strongly cautioned, however, against the isolation of the eye, particularly its isolation from the sense of touch (as well as, on another level, from intellect and memory). He opposed philosophy and art which emphasized the use of the eye as camera, which tended "more and more to attribute a less conditioned reality to sight," and which granted "unique privileges to vision, in its raw, immediate and sensational sense."[83] For the film spectator the visual sense operates in isolation from the tactile sense. The camera itself is but an isolated, mechanical eye, and has nothing to do with the comprehensive unity of common-sense perception.

Lewis warned that partial or fragmented personal responses to the world, even though cumulatively they might involve an appearance of mass-unity of perception and thought, ultimately undermine the possibility for any kind of "objective" or common-sense public truth:

> It is our contention here that *it is because of the subjective disunity due to the separation, or separate treatment, of the senses, principally of sight and touch, that . . . . external disunity has been achieved.* It is but another case of the *morcellement* of the *one* personality, in this case into a tactile-observer on the one hand and a visual observer on the other, giving different renderings of the same thing. Its results must be the disintegration, finally, of any "public" thing at all. . . . [T]he cutting up of the ideal, public, *one*, exterior, reality of human tradition, into manifold spaces and times, leads to a fundamental "subjectivity" of one sort or the other. And we would emphasize that our ideal, objective, world, which was wrought into a unity--the common ground of imaginative reality on which we all meet--is being destroyed in favour of a fastidious egoism, based on a disintegration of the complex unit of the senses, and a granting of unique privileges to vision, in its raw, immediate and sensational sense.[84]

The danger, said Lewis, lay in the confusion of the actual world with that part of the world experienced by the isolated sense: "what results from the isolation of the space-world of touch and that of sight, is that the pure non-tactile visual world introduces a variety of things to us, on a footing of equality as existing things, which in the world of common-sense (where the tactile sense is fused with the visual) do not possess that equality. Thus it is that the mirror-image draws level with the 'thing' it reflects."[85] Common-sense, the "picture of the plain-man," the "one general sense of things that we all hold in common," was to be transformed "into the terms of this highly-complex disintegrated world, of private 'times' and specific amputated 'spaces,' of serial-groups and 'events' (in conformity with the dominance of the time-factor) in place of 'things.'"[86] This latter world was the one, said Lewis, of the "cinematograph, or pattern-group."[87]

A specific example taken from the cinema and symbolizing the disintegrated world of which Lewis wrote is the close-up. The close-up is one of the extreme forms of the specialized vision of the cinema. Béla Balázs wrote that "the close-up not only isolates objects in space, but seems to lift them out of space entirely and transfer them to a conceptual space in which different laws obtain."[88] Lewis, aware of the role of the close-up in alienating the eye from the hand, playfully provided a fictional close-up of precisely that: an eye alienated from the hand. It appears at the end of Monstre Gai as Pullman and the Bailiff look through a suddenly darkening window:

> While [Pullman's] eyes remained fixed . . . he saw the whole area of the window blotted out, from the outside, by something blue and green. It had curved lines all over it; it looked like glass . . . it appeared to be lighted from within. . . .
>
> "Somebody's eye," he remarked. . . .[89]

This incident proceeds to a satiric comment on the logical conclusion of letting specialization in the senses estrange sight from touch, eye from hand:

> The room became almost entirely dark, as something began forcing its way in. . . . [S]omething was entering the room.
>
> . . . .
>
> What had entered the room was now opposite to them, slowly moving forward. It reached almost from ceiling to floor, and was covered with strong semicircular lines. It was almost touching Pullman. . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . It was a finger.[90]

* * *

Wyndham Lewis repeatedly stated his position on the part played by the camera in the break-down of common-sense, objective, public truth. In The Demon of Progress in the Arts he wrote: "The senses of . . . e[illegible]lier publics had not been vulgarized and demoralized, as ours have, by camera and a hundred other devices."[91] Although Lewis did acknowledge the potential role of the camera for the creation of art, he distinguished nevertheless between the rigidly-defined object perceived by the limited vision of the camera, and what he called "the 'art object' or the object of 'common-sense:'" "the external world can be looked at very variously. . . . [The] same object, under the eye of science or under the microscope, and beneath the human eye, or, alternatively, in the mind of the camera, or of the mathematician, or of 'common-sense,' will be a very different object."[92] "Nature," Lewis cautioned, "is not a photograph--odd as this may sound to a public who thinks of nature at second hand, in terms of Movie or Press photography. Nature is only converted into a photograph by the medium of men's machines."[93]

In 1938 Lewis wrote in a letter to the Times that he deplored art "whose 'tradition' dates no farther than the camera obscura."[94] Speaking of a current art show, he decried the "photographic puppetry" which he saw as the "ignoblest mechanical travesty of nature."[95] The work of Seurat represented for Lewis a way of seeing modified by the scientific instruments of the previous century, especially the camera, which he called "the nineteenth-century robot."[96] The conjunction of art and science in the work of Seurat, Lewis said, "perpetuated all that Impressionism absorbed from the photograph, especially in his earliest work: and in his 'divisionism' he consummated in the most absolute fashion the typically nineteenth-century mesalliance of art and science."[97]

Lewis stated that even representational painting, if it is good, is preferable to the mechanical, alienating vision of the camera eye. The painter, Lewis said, "will always out-point the camera."[98] Lewis lamented that the painter's vision had been impoverished by the ascendancy of the camera, and later by the presence of the cinema. The entire world, Lewis said, was developing the myopic vision of the camera eye, which, with the absent-mindedness characteristic of the machine, was usurping the traditional function of the artist:

> for the historian of the future the Industrial Revolution will overshadow the great political explosion in France. The artists of the second half of the nineteenth century had moved deep into the industrial age, of which the invention of the camera was an integral part. Along with the aftermath of the French Revolution (which affected things for the bad as well as for the good), the Industrial Revolution rapidly resulted in a vulgarization of the whole of society from which we still suffer--the Hollywood cinema is something which could not have existed prior to the industrial age.[99]

E. CINEMA AS DREAM (1): SURREALISM

CONSCIOUSNESS IS THE MOST TROUBLESOME COMMON-SENSE FACT OF ANY SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS. (Wyndham Lewis, 1927)[100]

The fragmentation of common-sense, said Lewis, found its ideal mode of literary expression in the stream-of-consciousness convention of the contemporary novel. Watching the "thought-stream" or "unorganized word-dreaming" of a character's mind, Lewis wrote, referring particularly to Gertrude Stein and James Joyce, is like watching photographs appear on a cinema screen. Lewis explicitly established this association of stream-of-consciousness novel and motion picture in _The Art of Being Ruled_ (1926). He reiterated his point in _Time and Western Man_ (1927):

> The repetition (used by Miss Stein) is . . . in the nature of a photograph of the unorganized word-dreaming of the mind when not concentrated for some logical functioning purpose. Mr. Joyce employed this method with success (not so radically and rather differently) in _Ulysses_. The thought-stream or word-stream of his _hero's_ mind was supposed to be photographed.
>
> . . . .
>
> . . . [B]y the devious route of a fashionable naturalist device--that usually described as "presenting the character from the _inside_"--and the influence exercised on him by Miss Stein's technique of picturesque dementia--Mr. Joyce reaches the half-demented _crank_ figure of traditional english humour.[101]

Lewis saw inherent in the cinema a naturalism analogous to the attempted naturalism of the stream-of-consciousness novel: "In his professional displays the Screen-worker in the nature of things is the last word in naturalism, at the opposite pole to a formal art."[102]

* * *

When carried far enough, the cinema-like naturalism of the stream-of-consciousness writers turned up, Lewis pointed out, as the hardened super-naturalist dogma of the Surrealists. The Surrealists tried to formalize a liquefaction of reality and illusion in a way analogous to the cinema's dissolution of traditional demarcations between a world of illusion and a real world--to the cinema's "surrealism of dreams."[103]

In _The Diabolical Principle and the Dithyrambic Spectator_ (1931) Lewis was highly critical of the Surrealist dogma which insisted on the dissolving of normal consciousness in the solvent of dream-reality. The Surrealist convention of turning all of life into art only vulgarized the concept of art itself. All viable art, Lewis pointed out, is already "super-real."[104] In the _Diabolical Principle_ also Lewis brought the novel and the film together again into the same focus by identifying in the work of Gertrude Stein and in the films of commercial Russia manifestations of an "art" operating within the parameters of the Surrealists' purpose--the creation of a "dream-aesthetic of 'Super-reality:'"[105] "The actual merging of the dream-condition and the waking-condition (of the external and the internal) must result in a logical emulsion of the forms and perspectives of life as we know them. Translated into an art-expression, it will approximate most closely to the art of the child. That is, of course, what has everywhere occurred with the theorists of that persuasion. The infantile is the link between the Super-realists and Miss Stein."[106] Films, Lewis insisted, serve as a tool in re-defining life in terms of the dream condition.

> The dream, indeed the opium-dream or the coke-dream, of the super-realists, is to be imposed upon the living material of life. It is "art" going over into life and changing it, so that it shall conform to its fantasy. . . . And it is artificial because it has fed upon a life falsified with doctrine, and merged in dream. Or, if we call it a dream instead of an art, then, as a dream it is evidently a sort of static nightmare of the Maldorer order. It is its avowed programme "to evoke the logic of pathological terror" and to shock human society "to its foundations." And that is also one of the avowed objectives of the communists in their Films. But horror, or "pathological terror," however useful in politics, is not of the same standing in art.[107]

Lewis's view of Surrealism--a vulgarized infantilism in which "art" only parodies its own function--illuminates the perspective which he brought also to his thinking on the cinema. It is a perspective which comes out of his assessment of the situation created by the world-wide presence of the cinema, a situation in which reality itself becomes but a parody of the film's dream-reality or vice versa. A description by Sherwood Anderson, which Lewis quoted in Paleface, illustrates the condition Lewis questioned: "I went often to the movie studios and watched the men and the women at work. Children, playing with dreams--dreams of an heroic kind of desperado cowboy, doing good deeds at the business end of a gun--dreams of an ever-virtuous womankind walking amid vice--American dreams--Anglo-Saxon dreams."[108]

The cinema as a medium appropriate for breaking down the distinctions between dream and actuality, and the merging of the two, appears as a theme in Lewis's novel, The Revenge for Love (1937).[109] Margaret (Margot), in one instance in the novel, is particularly distressed by the question of the nature of reality. Of Sean O'Hara and his friends she wonders: "were they real?"[110] or were they but "phantoms," or "ghost-persons," or "shadow-persons?"[111] Margot, who, as we have already noted, can substitute for the image of her husband the image of Clark Gable from time to time, now is led to try to identify seriously just what is actually real in her life: "Was this after all a great complicated dream she had got into against her volition, where all these vivid likenesses of life only existed in her dreaming mind?"[112] The creatures who flicker ambiguously through her inner and outer worlds are like screen images, having only a mechanical reality: "they were not in fact very real at all. . . . They were a dangerous crowd of shadows. . . . But if you stood up to them, if you called their noisy shadow-bluff, . . . if it came to a showdown, between a shadow and a man of flesh and blood--they would give way. . . . They could only browbeat you like a gramaphone, or impose on you like the projections on the screen of the cinema. Spring up and face them, and they would give way before you. For they had no will. Their will to life was extinct, even if they were technically real."[113] Central among the figures whose very existence seemed to depend on one's looking at them is Abershaw (German--aber shau: but look). Referred to as a "highly bogus personage," an "automatism," a "negation of a person," and an "insolent shadow-person,"[114] he is of the same type as many film-people crowded into parts of The Childermass.

* * *

Lewis spoke of the stream-of-consciousness novel in terms which for him indicated its resemblance to the cinema, as well as to the Surrealist mock-childish confusion of illusion and reality. He spoke most often of the writing of Joyce in this regard, and was not at a loss for other labels beside "childish" to describe Joyce's work. Lewis saw as excessive the application of a super-realist technique to situations which to him at times would have warranted quite different treatment. Regretting the fact that Joyce had chosen to exercise his talents in the stream-of-consciousness mode, Lewis said: "the 'unpunctuated' picture of Ulysses . . . is merely a device . . . for presenting the disordered spouting of the imbecile low-average mind--it has no other justification (and . . . it is a pity Joyce has adopted that gibbering as a vehicle for the expression of everything. . .)."[115]

The apparent rejection of the creative aspect of a character's intelligence by contemporary writers, and the celebration in the stream-of-consciousness novel of the disordered flashings of the undisciplined mind, led Lewis to organize attacks on what he called the "myth of the imbecile, the childish artist, [which] has been one of the most destructive engines in the war against the conceptual stronghold of the intellect."[116] It was in the context of this view of anti-intellectualism that Lewis included the cult of the Child and the cult of the Demented. Chaplin he referred to as the "child-man," the "eternal suckling,"[117] and Stein as the "lunatic" writer who, he said, expressed herself with "a sort of gargantuan mental stutter:"[118]

> Under the heading of the Child we can group . . . Charlie Chaplin's art (he is always the small put-upon little Neuter, the little David confronting the giant world). . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> Under the heading of the Demented you get Miss Gertrude Stein and the various stammering, squinting, punning group who follow her.[119]

In Satire and Fiction (1930) Lewis gave a more complete list of the categories of beings whom he considered eligible for the justifiable explorations of the stream-of-consciousness or interior monologue novelists: "In dealing with (1) the extremely aged, (2) young children, (3) half-wits, and (4) animals, the internal method can be extremely effective. In my opinion it should be entirely confined to those classes of characters."[120] Another naturalistic application of the stream-of-consciousness method would be in the depiction of a character who, said Lewis, "is half asleep, day-dreaming, its mind wandering."[121]

F. CINEMA AS DREAM (2): LADY FREDIGONDE FOLLETT

I OFTEN CONSIDER, WHEN I AM IN THE CINEMA, HOW MUCH EACH UNIQUE INDIVIDUAL SITTING IN THE DARKNESS THERE, WATCHING THAT REPRESENTATION OF OTHER INTERESTING INDIVIDUALS ON THE SCREEN, RESEMBLES THE SOLITARY CREATURES WHO SIT AT HOME BEHIND A VEIL OF WINDOW-CURTAINS, PEEPING OUT AT PASSERS-BY. THERE IS THE SAME ISOLATION, THE SAME ATTENTION, THERE IS SOMETHING OF THE SAME NEED. (Iris Barry, 1924)[122]

The "Prologue" to The Apes of God provides a significant insight into Lewis's fictional uses of the cinema and into his identification of the stream-of-consciousness novel with the cinema. The "Prologue" explores the world of a character whom Lewis considered suitable for stream-of-consciousness casting. One of Lewis's statements concerning the Joycean literary method, a statement to which Lewis appended a parenthetical reference to the central character of the "Prologue," supplies an introduction to the character and to his treatment of her: "The Ulyssean 'thought-stream' method is only appropriate to the depiction of children, morons, and the extremely infirm (Fredigonde)."[123]

Lady Fredigonde Follett is Lewis's object of satire in the "Prologue." She is used to parody the aggregate of fictional characters created by the prevailing literary orthodoxy--the "Miriam Hendersons" of the time. She is

Lewis's mock-ideal of this group of characters. Like the typical stream-of-consciousness specimen, as seen through Lewis's eyes, she lives largely in a solipsistic, mental world. Her withdrawal into this world means, Lewis insisted, the eclipse of her common-sense by a confined, subjectively rigid mental apparatus: "It had been at the alloted span that the great reversal had been completed, of outside into in--so all that is external was become nothing but bursts of dreaming."[124] She was largely confined to the world of what Lewis called her "private cinema:"[125] "Fredigonde again withdrew. She closed her eye-lids to relax herself. The day and night cinema that exists immediately within was encouraged to operate. The brain on its own initiative from its projector was flashing lace-caps upon the screen. All her collection was idly called forth, in startling close-ups, for her inspection."[126]

Lady Fredigonde, decrepit and half out of life, personally occupies only an isolated vantage point as she carries on her precarious existence. She has regressed from what once might have been a quite balanced view of reality, to what is now a primitive, irrational gesture of response to life. Loss of memory isolates her from past experience. Loss of senses restricts her means of assessing present experience. She slips easily into a world of "private 'times' and specific amputated 'spaces.'"[127] Outer and inner eye readily throw up only a "private photo-play"[128] for her amusement: "Cut off from the optic or tactile connections, Fredigonde passed most of her time in her mental closet, a hermit in her own head."[129] She is the Stein-technique personified: "Sometimes she would Stein away night and morning to herself, making patterns of conversations, . . . a veritable peasant industry, of personal chatterboxing and shortsighted nonsense."[130]

Fredigonde's inner eye and her now-decrepit physical eye, to which Lewis drew attention by labelling it the "fredigondean" eye,[131] function at times alternatively but with more or less similar limitations and possibilities. Views of the "private photo-play" alternate in Fredigonde's mind with external views, for example, of herself reflected in her hand-mirror, as her maid performs her toilet: "'I must have been asleep,' said . . . this peculiar picture-fan, straight from her private cinema, 'did you notice it? I had a most eccentric experience.' The stiff fist of Fredigonde closed upon the handle of the glass. Sticking it (without looking) up into the air, she then cocked a detached pale eye . . . at the maid's handiwork."[132] To emphasize, through parody, the cinema-like quality of this "film spectator's" experience, Lewis--using a technique similar to one often employed by Richardson--transformed the window-space in Fredigonde's room into a cinema-like screen, much like the one we have already taken note of in _Monstre Gai_. Appropriately, it is a mechanized world which comes to view: "She directed her eyes upon the narrow opening in the curtains--where the important thoroughfare, beyond the gates of the private road, was visible. Idly she was watching the bodies of the omnibuses fit themselves into the space and slip out of it, slacking or speeding according to the pulsation of this current of machines. As if they had been shadows upon the ceiling, cast into a darkened room from a sunlit street underneath, she remarked their passage. The window before her shook with the weight of the super-traffic. The amusing skeleton of new skyscraping flats entered into novel combinations with the geometric maze of the patterned curtains."[133]

Fredigonde's body or, as Lewis would have it, her shell, is a machine-like extension of her inner mechanism. Like any cinema apparatus she is but a jumble of clock-work gears. Even her heart is "ticking like one-o'clock."[134] When she tries to walk, her "funeral goose-step [is] timed upon the rigid pattern of the second-hand of a considerable clock--with the left-left left-left of its difficult, heavy tick."[135]

Lewis cast Fredigonde upon the clock-work mould of Bergsonian time, a mould which Lewis saw as one which reduced existence to the ticking instability of a temporal fragmentation like the product of the cinema's lurching frame-by-frame attempts to reconstruct life. Even the movement of Fredigonde's personality demonstrates the patterns of clock-work controls: "Gradually . . . her personality made its appearance. Fragment by fragment she got it back, in rough hand-over-hand, a bitter salvage."[136]

Lewis's metaphoric use of the cinema in what he called the "slow-movement prelude" of *The Apes of God* raises many of the issues he explored on a larger scale in *The Childermass*. Lewis's own summing up in *Satire and Fiction*, his rationale for having created a character such as Fredigonde, explicitly provides also a gloss upon *The Childermass*:

> Fredigonde is half out of life, half in. The *interior* method was chosen in that instance as being particularly appropriate. Incidentally its use (for the purpose of projecting this brain-in-isolation, served only by senses paralyzed with age) is an exposure of the literary dogma of the *interior monologue*, regarded as a *universal* method. Where elsewhere in another satire (with "Satters" in *Childermass*) I made use of it, I did so with that even more clearly in view.[137]

G. CINEMA AS SATIRE: LEWIS'S EXTERNAL APPROACH

> SATIRE IS ACTION FROM ABOVE: HUMOUR IS ACTION FROM UNDERNEATH. THE SATIRIST LOOKS DOWN UPON THE HUMAN SCENE, ENLARGES IT FOR HIS PECULIAR ENDS, AND BY MEANS OF THE SORT OF LENSES EMPLOYED BY SWIFT IN GULLIVER, SHOWS THE EARWIG TO BE IN FACT A SMALL-SCALE DRAGON. (Wyndham Lewis, 1938)[138]

Wyndham Lewis's own style, even in passages parodying the stream-of-consciousness convention, does not itself adhere to the stream-of-consciousness syntax, for example, of Joyce or Stein. Nor, unlike the stream-of-consciousness novelists, does Lewis as narrator identify himself with the subjective visual and mental perspectives of his characters. Rather, Lewis's narrators retain a strong, traditional hold upon their material. Their point of view, except in short, infrequent cases of punning parodies of a specific style,[139] is reasonably continuous and largely external, rather than fragmented and exclusively internal. The overall effect on the reader is often that of watching a narrator describe a character who is participating, either explicitly or by implication, in the mechanical dream world of the cinema. At the same time the observed narrator is himself exempt from the flickers and vacillations of the character being satirized. Lewis, then, when he parodied the stream-of-consciousness technique of "photographing" the images of the mental world, did not simply mimic prevailing conventions, but engaged rather in an external, intellectual exposure of them.

However, the spirit of much of Lewis's fictional style is nevertheless directly related to the cinema. His belief that camera eye vision involves a highly specialized, peculiar way of perceiving informs his style, particularly in a novel such as The Apes of God. Lewis's writing shares the method and the satiric intentions of Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels, particularly the Lilliputian and Brobdingnagian passages. In Gulliver's Travels the narrator provides continuous interpretation of worlds organized visually by the application, so to speak, of distorting lenses. For example, Gulliver's close-up view of the "monstrous breast" of the Brobdingnagian maiden, Glumdalclitch, causes him to ponder momentarily upon the satiric function of a "magnifying glass" view of reality.[140]

It is a satiric, Swiftian eye-piece that Lewis so often utilized in his fiction. He used it, for example, to describe Lady Fredigonde, or more specifically, the "shell" of Lady Fredigonde. In "THE BODY LEAVES THE CHAIR" portion of the "Prologue" to The Apes of God the notion of camera eye vision as cold, brutal, and inevitably satiric directs the narrative. The lady is described, for example, as she begins to emerge from her chair: "A local briskness, of a muscular nature, was patent, in the depths of the chair. The massively-anchored person shook as if from the hidden hammering of a propeller, revolving at her stern, out of sight. A determined claw went out and grappled the alpenstock. It planted it at a forward cant to obtain the preliminary purchase."[141] The body seems to be as much an inanimate object as the chair: "Without fuss the two masses came apart. They were cut open into two pieces. . . . The unsteady solid rose a few inches. . . . It abstracted itself slowly. Something imperfectly animate had cast off from a portion of its self. It was departing, with a grim paralytic toddle, elsewhere."[142] Appearing finally "to rollick, to dance, a little, after the manner of a dying top,"[143] the aged lady, aided by her aged body-servant, negotiates a landing in another chair, another shell: "When they were near the rear of the chair, they took a course at a tangent, then tacked, passing around its left arm. . . . [Fredigonde] lowered her body into its appointed cavity, . . . ounce by ounce--back first, grappled to Bridget [her body-servant], bull-dog grit all-out--at last riveted as though by suction within its elastic crater, corseted by its mattresses of silk from waist to bottom, one large feeble arm riding the stiff billows of its substantial fluted brim."[144] Supreme humour underlines the unrelenting satire of Lewis's camera eye vision as the lady, having regained herself, "realized the tones of a muted fog-horn to exclaim--'There will come a time Bridget when I shall not be able to move about like that!'"[145]

The camera, typifying for Lewis the epitome of the machine, is here creating what it sees after its own image, so to speak. Lady Fredigonde, herself personifying the clock-work terms upon which she is viewed, can only presume to be human in her mechanistic world. Hers is the life of the movie-actor upon the screen, who only seems to move when an apparatus projects his image. Fredigonde is a part of what Lewis saw as a whole system of mechanized actors, actors who are given a show of life in an essentially mechanical universe.

At one level Lewis was writing satire to provide an antidote for the prevailing "cinematic" literary convention, the interior or stream-of-consciousness method. At another level, his own method, when thought of in terms he himself has introduced, is "cinematic."

In The Wild Body (1927) Lewis indicated why it is appropriate to view man and interpret him by means of the camera eye. Man is, Lewis wrote there, only a presumptuous object, "a thing behaving like a person."[146] Although a man's own eye may show that he wants to lay claim to a measure of humanness, the body, which the eye often treats in a detached way, mocks the hopes revealed through the eye. The disparity between the look of hopefulness in the eye and the actual level of performance of the body points to what Lewis in The Wild Body called "the root of the sensation of the comic."[147] The body, however, is embarrassingly available to any camera eye which might wish to "photograph and fix" it:[148] "The finest humour," Lewis wrote in The Wild Body, "is the great play-shapes blown up or given off by the tragic corpse of life underneath the world of the camera."[149]

In the case of Lady Fredigonde, her eye betrays her wish that her mechanical performance be a human performance. For example, at the end of her walk Fredigonde's "fixed eye was bloodless and without any animation, a stuffed eagle's sham optic in fact, or a glass eye in the head of a corpse--though the bellows plainly worked still, the shoulders slowly grinding on, blown up and let down with the labour of the breath."[150] However, the presumptuous belief that all is not death returns to Fredigonde: "the eyes began to strike more firmly and to register. It was apparent that a mind had moved in behind them. There was a great bustle all at once. Her head was lived in once again;"[151] and she utters the "muted fog-horn" cry which I have already noted as an example of Lewis's humour.

In the case of Fredigonde, Lewis's camera eye technique mocks the presumptuous hope of her own eye. Itself a part of a machine, it is as if the camera eye affirms man's role as an inanimate mechanism. In a philosophical sense, Lewis was pointing out that common-sense human perception can hardly function in a world where instruments and machines dominate. Cinema vision, as one form of specialized vision, is replacing the vision of common-sense.

* * *

In *Satire and Fiction* Lewis's discussion of the external, satiric aspect of *The Apes of God* leads to his celebration of the work as a novel of the Great Without. Ironically, this work of satire, which is Lewis's response to the work of his contemporaries, to the mental-cinema novels of the Great Within, itself depends so largely on a camera eye vision.

Lewis thought of satire, which he said "must deal with the *outside*,"[152] as though it were the very opposite to the stream-of-consciousness mode, which, he said, precludes satire: "To let the reader 'into the minds of the characters,' to 'see the play of their thoughts'--that is precisely the method least suited to satire."[153] In a statement in which Lewis's words, "the truth," might be taken to mean, "the corrective for faulty subjective vision," Lewis said: "Satire is in reality often nothing else but *the truth*, in fact that of Natural Science. That objective, non-emotional truth of the scientific intelligence sometimes takes on the exuberant sensuous quality of creative art: then it is very apt to be called 'satire,' for it has been bent not so much upon pleasing as upon being true."[154]

Stressing the distinction which he saw between his mode of writing and that of his contemporaries, two different uses of the camera eye approach, Lewis wrote that satire "is merely a formula based rather upon the 'truth' of the intellect than upon the 'truth' of the average romantic sensualism."[155]

Speaking specifically of the novel, The Apes of God, Lewis emphasized the manner in which he used the eye: "For The Apes of God it could, I think, quite safely be claimed, that no book has ever been written that has paid more attention to the outside of people. In it their shells, or pelts, or the language of their bodily movements, come first, not last."[156] Lewis readily accepted one critic's description that the novel is "the work of a visuel. . . . [E]verything is told from the outside. To this extent it is the opposite of, say, James, who sought to narrate from inside the character's mind."[157] (We may recall that Dorothy Richardson, in speaking of her own work in which everything is told from the inside, said that "it is possible to claim for Henry James . . . a far from inconsiderable technical influence.") "[I]n a world that is literally inundated with sexual viscera and the 'dark' gushings of the tides of The Great Within,"[158] Lewis essentially substituted his "camera eye" for that of his contemporaries. In his introduction to the 25th anniversary edition (1955) of The Apes of God, Lewis himself alluded to the camera as he recalled his satiric technique in that novel: "Many scenes could be shot merely by leaning out of one's window."[159]

Lewis concluded Satire and Fiction by stressing that "for an understanding of the literature of today and to-morrow it is very necessary . . . to grasp the principles involved in [the question] . . . of the respective merits of the method of internal and of external approach."[160] A series of itemized paragraphs, some of which are included below, provides reasons why he believed that "the method of external approach is the method that will, more and more, be adopted in the art of writing:"

> (1) The external approach to things belongs to the "classical" manner of apprehending: whereas the romantic outlook (though it may serve the turn of the "transitionists") will not, I believe, attract the best intelligences in the coming years, and will not survive the period of "transition."
>
> (2) The external approach to things (relying upon the evidence of the eye rather than of the more emotional organs of sense) can make a healthy and attractive companion of "the grotesque." Other approaches cannot do this. The scarab can be accommodated--even a crocodile's tears can be relieved of some of their repulsiveness. For the requirements of the new-world-order this is essential. And as for pure satire--there the eye is supreme.
>
> . . . .
>
> (4) If you consider the naturalism of the greek plastic as a phenomenon of decadence (contrasted with the masculine formalism of the Egyptian or the Chinese), then you will regard likewise the method of "the internal monologue" (or the romantic snapshotting of the wandering stream of the Unconscious) as a phenomenon of decadence.
>
> (5) A tumultuous stream of evocative, spell-bearing vocables, launched at your head--or poured into your Unconscious--is, finally, a dope only. It may be an auriferous mud, but it must remain mud--not a clear

> but a murky picture. As a literary medium it is barbaric.
>
> . . . .
>
> (8) . . . Shakespeare is the summit of the romantic, naturalist, european tradition. And there is a great deal more of that rousseauish, natural-springishness, in much recent work in literature than is generally recognised. But especially, in the nature of things, is this the case with the tellers-from-the-inside--with the masters of the "interior-monologue," with those Columbuses that have set sail toward the El Dorados of the Unconscious, or of the Great Within.
>
> (9) Dogmatically, then, I am for the Great Without, for the method of external approach, for the wisdom of the eye, rather than that of the ear.[161]

Lewis's quarrel with his literary contemporaries was not a matter of absolute positions. He wanted primarily to provide an alternative to the literary orthodoxy of his day, his camera eye for theirs. He remained willing to say of either method that "there is, in both cases, another truth, that is all."[162]

H. CINEMA AS MECHANISM (1): HENRI BERGSON

> TIME [IN THE NOVEL] CAN BE RETARDED, IT CAN BE ACCELERATED, AND, AS IN THE CINEMA, IT CAN BE ARTIFICIALLY CONSTRUCTED. IT IS CURIOUS HOW OFTEN THE IMAGE OF THE CINEMA HAS BEEN EVOKED FOR THE STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE PROBLEM OF TIME, FROM BERGSON ONWARDS. (J. Isaacs, 1951)[163]

Wyndham Lewis saw an inextricable association between the stream-of-consciousness vogue and what he called the fluid flabbiness and vagueness of Bergsonian time-philosophy. He maintained, for example, that the philosophical mainstay of Joyce's work, crammed as it was, he claimed, with "a mass of dead stuff," of "_nature-morte_," was the "duration-flux of Bergson:"[164] "Without all the uniform pervasive growth of the time-philosophy starting from the little seed planted by Bergson, discredited, and now spreading more vigorously than ever, there would be no _Ulysses_. . . . Mr. Joyce is very strictly of the school of Bergson-Einstein, Stein-Proust. He is of the great time-school they represent. His book is a _time-book_."[165] It is essential before proceeding to an examination of _The Childermass_ to look briefly at Bergson's theory of duration; and specifically at his introduction of the cinema as a metaphor for his theory. Lewis, who tried to expose what he saw as the dangerous weakness of Bergson's philosophy, did so largely by shifting the tenor and vehicle of the metaphor. It is Bergson's cinema metaphor which Lewis so thoroughly exploited in The Childermass.

Henri Bergson had introduced the concept of cinema into his development of a "durational" theory of reality. His theory was largely a reaction against the then traditionally accepted scientific, or intellectual, ways of gaining knowledge. These methods, Bergson maintained, led only to a fragmented knowledge of isolated moments or events. Scientific knowledge, he pointed out, was a clockwork knowledge dealing only with measurable, calculable features of life, not with life's internal reality. The cinema, Bergson's metaphor, illustrated what was for him the mechanistic nature of human knowledge. Lewis, taking note of Bergson's cinema analogy, wrote of Bergson that he "[ascribed] to human knowledge an intermittent, cinematographic character."[166]

Bergson understood cinema--or, as he called it in referring to the film apparatus itself, the cinematograph--in terms of its mechanical character. The apparent movement of the screen image, he noted at a time when the jerkiness of the picture made his point more apparent than it would be today, depends on the quick succession of a series of instantaneous snapshots which are projected onto a screen. In Creative Evolution (1907; first English translation, 1911) he emphasized that each picture was itself lifeless: "If we had to do with photographs alone, however much we might look at them, we should never see them animated: with immobility set beside immobility, even endlessly, we could never make movement."[167] The motion on the screen is only an artificial animation, produced by the mechanical movement of the film apparatus:

> It is because the film of the cinematograph unrolls, bringing in turn the different photographs of the scene to continue each other, that each actor of the scene recovers his mobility; he strings all his successive attitudes on the invisible movement of the film. The process then consists in extracting from all the movements peculiar to all the figures an impersonal movement abstract and simple, movement in general, so to speak: we put this into the apparatus, and we reconstitute the individuality of each particular movement by combining this nameless movement with the personal attitudes. Such is the contrivance of the cinematograph. And such is also that of our knowledge.[168]

The mechanism of man's knowledge, said Bergson, depends entirely on piecemeal reconstructions of isolated, fragmented facts:

> Instead of attaching ourselves to the inner becoming of things, we place ourselves outside them in order to recompose their becoming artificially. We take snapshots, as it were, of the passing reality, and, as these are characteristic of the reality, we have only to string them on a becoming, abstract, uniform, and invisible, situated at the back of the apparatus of knowledge, in order to imitate what there is that is characteristic in this becoming itself. Perception, intellection, language so proceed in general. Whether we would think becoming, or express it, or even perceive it, we can hardly do anything else than set going a kind of cinematograph inside us. We may therefore sum up what we have been saying in the conclusion that the mechanism of our ordinary knowledge is of a cinematographical kind.[169]

The "cinematographic method" of knowledge, Bergson realized, is the only practicable one by which man may come to perceive and know his external actions. But transition or change, or "real" movement, remains elusive in terms of such a way of knowing. Man must be satisfied with experiencing only a kind of Steinian "perpetual recommencement"[170] of each static unit of what Bergson saw as a perpetual becoming.

All science, ancient and modern, "proceeds," according to Bergson, "according to the cinematographical method."[171] Greek philosophy, with its concepts of eternal Ideas or Forms, Bergson emphasized, reflects "the vision that a systematic intellect obtains of the universal becoming when regarding it by means of snapshots, taken at intervals, of its flowing."[172] For the ancients, to pass from the immutable to the changing or becoming was to pass from perfection to imperfection. Modern science was described by Bergson as an "egalitarian science,"[173] to use Lewis's phrase. The Greeks' qualitative consideration of the timeless moment, the eternal Form, becomes for the modern scientist a quantitative consideration of a multitude of arbitrarily dispersed moments. Refined instruments of research provide the modern scientist with means of achieving what might be called the democratizing of the moment. With the moderns there is an "indefinite breaking up of time."[174] In contrast to the ancients, the uniqueness in the approach of the moderns is, in a technical sense, only one of degree--there is simply "a higher precision"[175] in their measuring what still constitutes a series of static forms.

Bergson illustrated what he saw as the historical continuity of the application of the principle of the cinematographical mechanism by drawing an illustration which he might have taken from comparing Muybridge's[176] photographic experiments with horses and other animals to Greek sculpture: "Of the gallop of a horse our eye perceives chiefly a characteristic, essential or rather schematic attitude, a form that appears to radiate over a whole period and so fill up a time of gallop. It is this attitude that sculpture has fixed on the frieze of the Parthenon. But instantaneous photography isolates any moment; it puts them all in the same rank, and thus the gallop of a horse spreads out for it into as many successive attitudes as it wishes, instead of massing itself into a single attitude, which is supposed to flash out in a privileged moment and to illuminate a whole period."[177] Modern science, unlike that of the ancients, certainly strains toward encompassing movement itself--"A mechanized world is always in the process of getting ready to live,"[178] McLuhan has said of the cinema. Bergson, however, maintained that despite its refinements of measurements science will always fall short of such a goal: "In contrast with ancient science, which stopped at certain so-called essential moments, [modern science] is occupied indifferently with any moment whatever. But it always considers moments, always virtual stopping-places, always, in short, immobilities. Which amounts to saying that real time, regarded as a flux, or, in other words, as the very mobility of being, escapes the hold of scientific knowledge."[179] However, modern science, allowing no qualitatively superior moment in any series of changing forms, at least does not diminish the importance of time or change. Bergson, in light of the contemporary acceptance of time as an independent and all-important variable, said that in modern science the "flux of time is the reality itself, and the things which we study are the things which flow."[180]

To complete the ultimately futile straining of modern science toward the apprehension of time and change, there was, for Bergson, the need for "another knowledge:"[181] "This second kind of knowledge would . . . set the cinematographical method aside."[182] Although this new metaphysics would not necessarily be useful from the pragmatic point of view, it would, said Bergson, hold reality itself. It would embrace "the flow of time, . . . the very flux of the real:"[183]

> Not only may we thus complete the intellect and its knowledge of matter by accustoming it to install itself within the moving, but by developing also another faculty, complementary to the intellect, we may open a perspective on the other half of the real. For, as soon as we are confronted with true duration, we see that it means creation, and that if that which

> is being unmade endures, it can only be because it is inseparably bound to what is making itself. Thus will appear the necessity of a continual growth of the universe, I should say of a life of the real. And thus will be seen in a new light the life which we find on the surface of our planet, a life directed the same way as that of the universe, and inverse of materiality. To intellect, in short, there will be added intuition.[184]

For Bergson, then, "science and metaphysics are two opposed although complementary ways of knowing, the first retaining only moments, that is to say, that which does not endure, the second bearing on duration itself."[185]

I. CINEMA AS MECHANISM (2): WYNDHAM LEWIS

> THE FACT . . . IS THAT BERGSON'S PHILOSOPHY OF BECOMING COINCIDES HISTORICALLY WITH THE WORK OF THE ITALIAN FUTURISTS, THE EARLY CUBISTS, THE 'CONTINUOUS PRESENT' OF GERTRUDE STEIN, THE 'STREAM-OF-CONSCIOUSNESS' TECHNIQUE IN FICTION, . . . THE PREOCCUPATION WITH THE MYSTERY OF TIME IN THE NOVELS OF MARCEL PROUST, . . . AND WITH THE ASCENDANCY OF THE MOTION PICTURE TO THE PRINCIPLE ART FORM OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. (Weller Embler, 1971)[186]

Bergsonian duration was for Wyndham Lewis abstract mechanism. Lewis saw as a hoax Bergson's emphasis on the organic or continuous aspect of the postulated duration. In particular, it was the arbitrariness of the philosophic emphasis on Time, at the expense of the spatial entity, the single, clearly articulated Form, to which Lewis was opposed.

Bergson and the time-school, in placing a premium on time and change as ultimate realities, constitute what Lewis called an "abstract school."[187] Lewis, who favoured a system of reality which is oriented toward acknowledgement of the discrete concreteness of things, did not accept as credible what he saw as Bergson's view, that "behind the perceptual facade, or beneath the inanimate carapace, is an organic existence."[188] For Lewis, the postulated organic reality of Bergsonian thought could only be an abstraction. "The specific advertisement of the 'organic' theory," he said, "should be regarded only as bluff:"[189] "The more abstract the less real, we [that is, Lewis] would say, since however abstract, it is still an abstraction from what is dead. Into both the dead shell and the mechanical laws that obtain throughout 'matter' and which are for us subjective appearances, we wish to put no more 'reality' metaphysically, and as explanation of the world, than nature has provided it with. We experience no desire to bring it to life."[190] The apparent lifelikeness of the once dead scientific object, said Lewis, reflects Bergson's wish to invest modern physics, which Lewis saw as being most useful, with a metaphysical reality. The altered way of interpreting the world, Lewis insisted, violates the common-sense picture of reality by positing a non-visual abstraction which questions the integrity of material reality: "Surely it is the abstraction of the materialistic picture of science that puts the *movement* and the *fusion* into it? that 'time,' in short, that is the mind of Space, that stirs it up? It is certainly not our eyes that are responsible for it. Sound, it is true, suggests movement generally: but vision does not."[191] Lewis continued elsewhere: "movement, or things apprehended in movement, are very much more abstract than are static things. . . . *[T]ime is more abstract than space*."[192] Lewis was determined to defend against what he saw as the Bergsonian threat to the "'spatializing instinct' of man,"[193] a threat which he saw as rooted in Bergson's mentalism: "First of all 'Time,' for Bergson, is mental as opposed to physical,"[194] said Lewis. Elsewhere he added: "It was that 'spatialization' that the doctrinaire of motion and of mental 'time' attacked."[195]

Lewis's "external, objective, physical, material world" is, he said, the world to which "the hellenic sculpture . . . belongs,"[196] a world "arranged on the principles of surfaces and lines."[197] Bergson's world, said Lewis, is an anti-spatial world of "Time and 'restless' interpenetration;" a world in which all objects disintegrate into a "fluid, futuristic mass," a "vivacious, hot, mercurial broth."[198] For Lewis it was the clarity of the single, readily-contemplated object which was most important:

> the Time conception of Bergson seems to us entirely to misrepresent the role of Space, and, as it were, shuffle and transpose their respective "realities." . . . [W]hat we seek to stimulate . . . is a philosophy that will be as much a spatial-philosophy as Bergson's is a time-philosophy. As much as he enjoys the sight of things "penetrating" and "merging," do we enjoy the opposite picture of them standing apart--the wind blowing between them, and the air circulating freely in and out of them: much as he enjoys the "indistinct," the "qualitative," the misty, sensational and ecstatic, very much more do we value the distinct, the geometric, the universal, non-qualitied--the clear and the light, the unsensational. To the trance of music, with its obsession of Time, with its inalienable emotional urgency and visceral agitation, we prefer what Bergson calls "obsession of Space." . . .
>
> . . . Space keeps still, at least is not (ideally) occupied in incessantly slipping away,

> melting into the next thing, and repudiating its integrity. Regarding mind as Timeless, it is more at home, we find, with Space.[199]

In staging his war against the time-mind, Lewis was trying to restore essential values which he felt were being abandoned by Western man: "Space seems to us by far the greater reality of the two, and Time meaningless without it. Time as change was the 'Nothing' of the Greek, and it is ours. Space is rapidly, under the guidance of a series of Bergsons, each Time-obsessed, becoming the 'Nothing' of the modern European."[200]

Lewis saw Bergson's philosophy favour not only the abstract but also the mechanistic. It brings to a culmination, said Lewis, the nineteenth-century predisposition toward the mechanistic idea of progress: "The material had already collected into a considerable patrimony by the time Bergson was ready to give it a philosophic form. The darwinian Theory and all the background of nineteenth-century materialistic thought was already behind it. Under the characteristic headings Duration and Relativity the nineteenth-century mechanistic belief has now assumed a final form."[201] Lewis insisted that "locomotion and movement, 'organism' in the making, or becoming, not become, what is that but a machine? Indeed, since it is a function, not anything describable as a thing, it is a system or process and essentially mechanistic."[202]

Having analyzed Bergson's time-philosophy as mechanistic, as well as abstract, Lewis went on to declare that it is also, in its manifestations, cinematic. Retaining in principle the essence of Bergson's own metaphorical use of the cinematograph, Lewis inverted Bergson to underline the specifically cinematic nature of Bergsonian philosophy and its expression in the arts. In exposing what he saw as the cinematographic nature of Bergsonian doctrine, Lewis made particular use of the Futurists. He saw Futurist art as a direct extension of Bergson's theories of duration:[203]

> Dispersal and transformation of a space-phenomenon into a time-phenomenon throughout everything--that is the trick of this doctrine. Pattern, with its temporal multiplicity, and its chronologic depth, is to be substituted for the thing, with its one time, and its spatial depth. A crowd of hurrying shapes, a temporal collectivity, is to be put in the place of the single object of what it hostilely indicates as the "spatializing" mind. The new dimension introduced is the variable mental dimension of time. So the notion of the transformed "object" offered us by this doctrine is plainly in the nature of a "futurist" picture, like a running dog with a hundred legs and a dozen backs and heads. In place of the characteristic static "form" of greek Philosophy, you have a series, a group, or . . . a reiteration. In place of a "form" you have a "formation"--as it is characteristically called--a repetition of a particular shape; you have a battalion of forms in place of one form.[204]

Lewis consistently stressed that in "Bergson's gospel of fluidity and illiquation" is to be found the "philosophic basis of futurism and similar movements."[205]

* * *

Lewis used the Futuristic picture as a model in his warning against the effects of Bergsonian metaphysics and art upon the individual. The individual becomes what he beholds, said Lewis. He who was once "the counterpart of what formerly has been . . . a material object" becomes "no longer one, but many. . . . [Y]ou become a phalanstery of selves:"[206] "In your turn, 'you' become the series of your temporal repetitions; you are no longer a centralized self, but a spun-out, strung-along series, a pattern-of-a-self, depending like the musical composition upon time; an object, too, always in the making, who are your states. So you are a history; there must be no Present for you. You are an historical object, since your mental or time-life has been as it were objectified."[207] The special loss, said Lewis, would be to the individual as subject, as mind, as thinker: "By this proposed transfer from the beautiful objective, material world of common-sense, over to the 'organic' world of chronological mentalism, you lose not only the clearness of outline, the static beauty, of the things you commonly apprehend; you lose also the clearness of outline of your own individuality which apprehends them."[208]

Lewis, taking the Futurists' celebration of the machine as the specific manifestation of the influence of the time-philosophy, introduced into some of his novels fictional renderings of the mentality produced by the contemporary machine-worship, often automobile-worship:

"The italian futurists--with their évangile of action, and its concomitants, speed, violence, impressionism and sensation in all things--incessant movement with the impermanence associated with that, as the ideal of a kind of suicidal faith--they were thoroughly adepts of the time-philosophy: and Marinetti, their prophet, was a pur-sang bergsonian."[209] It was Lewis's intention to debunk the praise of the machine. Worship of it was not only misplaced but belated. He had written in the 1914 issue of Blast:

> AUTOMOBILISM (Marinetteism) bores us. We don't want to go about making a hullo-bulloo about motor cars, anymore than about knives and forks, elephants or gas-pipes.
>
> Elephants are VERY BIG. Motor cars go quickly.
>
> Wilde gushed twenty years ago about the beauty of machinery. Gissing, in his romantic delight with modern lodging houses was futurist in this sense.
>
> The futurist is a sensational and sentimental mixture of the aesthete of 1890 and the realist of 1870.[210]

Lewis believed that man should utilize the machine and understand the effects of its presence, not ludicrously adore it. In The Apes of God Dick Whittingdon, Lady Fredigonde's nephew, represents the fashionable motorist upon whom this old movie fan dotes: "Ah you young space-eating spalpeen, you."[211] His latest "mechanical toy"[212] is a new Bugatti.

Having found the cinematographic principle of successive pictures or formation, as opposed to a single integrated picture or form, in Futurist art, Lewis provided in The Revenge for Love a prolonged fictional illustration of the relationship between the cinematographic principle and the Futurists' automobilism. Stressing in particular the effects of automobilism--and, at the same time, of the cinema--upon life itself, Lewis emphasized the breakdown of perception and the fragmentation of experience which are perpetrated by them. In the novel Victor Stamp, Margot's fantasized Clark Gable, plays the role of the Futurists' man-of-action when Margot faces him with the necessity of having to flee from the Spanish police in their own car, their "big speed-toy."[213] During the flight the transformation of the world into a cinematograph is described in terms of Margot's perception:

> . . . trees, rocks, and telegraph-poles stood up dizzily before her and crashed down behind. They were held up stiffly in front of her astonished eyes, then snatched savagely out of the picture. Like a card-world, clacked cinematographically through its static permutations by the ill-bred fingers of a powerful conjurer, everything stood upon end and then fell flat. He showed you a tree--a cardboard tree. Fix your eyes upon this! he said. Then with a crash it vanished. Similarly with a segment of cliff. Similarly with a telegraph-pole.
>
> Her head ached with the crash of images. Every time a telegraph-pole fell down she felt the shock of its collapse in the picture-house of the senses. This rushing cosmos filled her with a bleak dismay. She had not foreseen their mad charge through this forest of objects; and her senses quailed.
>
> Above all she detested this charging beast, that muscular machine. Pounding beneath her, it carried her forward, she knew, by means of unceasing explosions. Very well. But in this act she must co-operate. To devour miles and to eat up minutes, in gulp after gulp, use must be made of _her_ organs, so it seemed, as well as its own. Under her feet she had a time-eating and space-guzzling automaton. . . . It was _her_ time, too, it was gobbling up--under great pressure, in big passionate draughts.[214]

When, through the wind-screen frame of the car, Margot sees one of two armed Spanish Civil Guards blocking the roadway, her cry for Victor to stop the car is, in terms of its futility, like the cry of a film spectator urging the events of a movie to stop: "it was quite unavailing to shout at events--at events three seconds off. As well talk to Time and tell it where to stand! . . . It was this machine--it would not stop."[215] The head-long rush of the "actors" in the car, like the head-long rush of events reeling through film apparatus, becomes in this case also the head-long rush, toward each other, of two of man's technological extensions of himself. There was "the man that was a gun, and the man that was a car."[216] Margot's "cinema show" captures the horror:

> She saw the two Guards get bigger and get bigger. It was as if in a series of blinks. . . .
>
> Screaming and staring she went through that expanding second where time stopped. . . . What she saw appeared to her in fragments, but in too great detail, for it was incoherent.
>
> . . . She saw the Guard leap aside, . . . but leap too late.
>
> . . . They in their car were like a cork, tossed in some turgid medium--through which, however, they had passed. . . . A bit of pitching and rolling was only to be expected, in this storm of shadows and lit-up objects.[217]

The automobile, the more modern technological development, kills the man with the gun. The car's lethal effectiveness at the physical level underlines the nature of those aspects which Lewis here associated with the car--the propensity in man for a Futuristic automobilism, moulded on the principle of cinematographic dynamism.

* * *

From Lewis's point of view the aesthetic conditions of Futurist art in many ways overlap with those of the stream-of-consciousness novel. Both hold in common a place in Lewis's thinking as manifestations of a cinematic, Bergsonian world that is "_not a world of distinct objects. It is an interpenetrating world of direct sensation_. . . . It is a _mental_, as it were an interior world, of palpitating movement, visually indistinct, electrical. . . . What we have to grasp in the Bergson world of 'durée,' is that it is an _interior_ world."[218] Joyce's work, for example, as much as Futurist art, supplied Lewis with material to illustrate the abstract mentalism and mechanistic fragmentation which Lewis saw as central to the cinematic aspect of the Bergsonian world: "the secret of an _entire_ organism escapes [Joyce]. Not being observant where entire people (that is, people at all) are concerned, he depicts them conventionally always, under some general label. For it is in the fragmentation of a personality--by isolating some characteristic weakness, mood, or time-self--that you arrive at the mechanical and abstract, the opposite of living."[219]

Having found in contemporary literature and painting the expression of the cinematic aspect of Bergsonian philosophy, Lewis turned to the cinema in _The Childermass_ to provide an extensive fictional documentation of his view of the nature and the effects of the cinematic presence in life. The Childermass is an exploration of a world in which technologies have suddenly altered perceptual correlatives so that the common-sense may not function effectively; and it is a parody of contemporary art which Lewis saw as having the effect of producing the "opposite of living."

J. THE CHILDERMASS (1): THE CINEMA AND THE MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS

> [FILM ACTORS] FEEL AS THOUGH THEY WERE IN EXILE. IN EXILE, . . . IN A SENSE FROM THEMSELVES. BECAUSE THEIR ACTION, THE LIVE ACTION OF THEIR LIVE BODIES, THERE, ON THE SCREEN OF THE CINEMATOGRAPH, NO LONGER EXISTS: IT IS THEIR IMAGE ALONE, CAUGHT IN A MOMENT, IN A GESTURE, AN EXPRESSION, THAT FLICKERS AND DISAPPEARS, . . . A DUMB IMAGE WHICH QUIVERS FOR A MOMENT ON THE SCREEN AND DISAPPEARS, IN SILENCE, IN AN INSTANT, LIKE AN UNSUBSTANTIAL PHANTOM, THE PLAY OF ILLUSION UPON A DINGY SHEET OF CLOTH. (Luigi Pirandello, 1916)[220]

Wyndham Lewis's *The Childermass*, which in 1951 he described as "the book [he] set most store by,"[221] is his most involved fictional exploration of the implications of the existence of the cinema. For the most part this and the following chapter of this study will be concerned with the nature of Lewis's descriptions in *The Childermass* of the conditions of a post-earthly environment or, speaking in terms of Lewis's polemics, a post-common-sense environment defined by what Lewis saw as a cinema-like reality. Most of the descriptive passages in question occupy approximately the first 100 pages of *The Childermass*, pages Yeats once singled out as "a masterpiece."[222]

At the outset of the story Pullman and Satterthwaite, innocents from a world not yet complicated by the proliferation of mass media, find themselves in an afterlife condition in the midst of what is described as a "dead environment,"[223] an environment which recalls Lewis's descriptions of the period created by the rapid introduction of new media systems such as the wireless, the press, and the cinema. It is the world of a new Year One, and Lewis, as Marshall Mcluhan has pointed out, "is concerned precisely with accelerated media change as a kind of massacre of the innocents."[224]

In the narrative Pullman and Sattersthwaite or, as they are more often called, Pulley and Satters, alias Joyce and Stein, pass their time in an internment camp administered by a character known as the Bailiff, who is a vulgarized Bergsonian time-advocate. Pulley and Satters, who had been friends, after a fashion--Pulley as master, Satters as fag--on earth, and who here resume a form of this relationship, are waiting to be allowed to enter the magnetic city which lies beyond the river, the water of which turns out to be a kind of time-stuff. Their traditional modes of interpreting experience, especially that concerning matters of time and space, have been suspended, and a dubious survival attends them as they naively struggle to adapt to the conditions of the new world.

The river is, appropriately, one of the pervasive features of this world which, at one level, represents the mental world of the stream-of-consciousness hero. In his discussion of Joyce in Time and Western Man, Lewis associated the river, or the stream, with the stream-of-consciousness convention: "the author . . . plunges with you. He takes you inside his head, or, as it were, into a roomy diving-suit, and, once down in the middle of the stream, you remain the author, naturally, inside whose head you are, though you are sometimes supposed to be aware of one person, sometimes of another. . . . Some figures for a moment bump against you, and you certainly perceive them with a great distinctness--or rather some fragment of their dress or some mannerism; then they are gone. But, generally speaking, it is _you_ who descend into the flux."[225] Elsewhere in _Time and Western Man_ Lewis associated the image of the river explicitly with Bergson, whom he called one of the "river officials of the great River Flux."[226] In _Satire and Fiction_ Lewis described the "slow-movement Prelude" of Lady Fredigonde's "thought-stream" as a Styx, as "the sluggish introspective waters of a Styx."[227] In _The Childermass_ the river, which holds no organic life, is referred to by Lewis as "this Styx;" and wandering alongside this river Pulley is described as "a lost automaton rather than a lost soul."[228] Pulley tells Satters that there are some who say that "the waves are years, the water is 'Time-stuff,' as they call it."[229] And of the shore he notes: "Some say . . . it is a mirage. . . . It's in another dimension. . . . It's not there really."[230] Some time later Pullman adds that "the river is the real thing, all the rest is shadow."[231] In the narrative the river is the actual "source" of the cinema-like experiences which first of all confront, but then also absorb and reflect, the helplessly disoriented "heroes" of the novel. The stream-of-consciousness becomes linked with the "stream" of cinema.

* * *

Satters, the more recent arrival at the camp and still more of a novice than Pulley at adapting himself to the peculiarities of the atmosphere, is incautiously watching a film sequence which emerges from the river and confronts the two friends:

> Satters in the dirty mirror of the fog sees a hundred images, in the aggregate, sometimes as few as twenty, it depends if his gaze is steadfast. Here and there their surfaces collapse altogether as his eyes fall upon them, the whole appearance vanishes, the man is gone. But as the pressure withdraws of the full-blown human glance the shadow reassembles, in the same stark posture, every way as before, at the same spot--obliquely he is able to observe it coming back jerkily into position. One figure is fainter than any of the rest, he is a thin and shabby mustard yellow, in colouring a flat daguerreotype or one of the personnel of a pre-war film, split tarnished and transparent from travel and barter. He comes and goes; sometimes he is there, then he flickers out.[232]

The pressure of the "full-blown human glance," causing this "motion picture" to lose its effect, implies that the power of an eye which still carries remnants of a common-sense way of seeing can defy the mode of the cinema, which is based on an appeal to a single, isolated sense. Lewis elsewhere (in Snooty Baronet, 1932) described the frustration of watching "a figure upon a cinematograph screen" by noting that it was "apt to go out at any moment, and turn up again, in some other place."[233]

The beings or images which Satters sees are known in The Childermass as peons. The peons--we may also call them, for example, film-beings or screen-folk--have the surrealistic quality of what often appears to be the eyeless characters of very old movies: "Grey-faced, a cracked parchment with beards of a like material, ragged wisps and lamellations of the skin, bandage-like turbans of the same shade, or long-peaked caps, their eyes are blank, like discoloured stones."[234] They are described, too, as having "inferior natures,"[235] and as moving, like Fredigonde in The Apes of God, with "clockwork regularity:"[236] "articulated with the stiffest joints they were walking slowly . . . but advancing very little."[237] In Doom of Youth (1932) Lewis defined peons simply as "ciphers,"[238] while in Filibusters in Barbary (1932) he placed a similar emphasis upon his description of actual film actors--a description which evokes the sense of the fictional peons of The Childermass: "These fifty dumb characters in search of an author dumb enough to concoct a plot and text for them . . . swarmed forward, vociferous and replete with a strident quality that was so thin as to stamp them anywhere as screen-folk--creatures that is of an art at one remove from the shadow-picture."[239]

Appropriately enough, it is along the river that the peons of the novel move, and from which they emerge. The river bank, Pulley observes, "is always empty, except for the peons."[240] They are transported in a crowded punt, from which they make their way to the shore as they disembark for their daily labour. Satters, who persists in watching these screen-folk, suddenly discovers that "the images take on for him abruptly a menacing directness."[241] Their appearance, which seems to be subject to uncontrolled factors such as those which at times actually affected the processes of early, relatively crude film production, varies slightly from time to time: "a darker shade rushes into the pigments, as it were, of them, like a wind springing up in their immaterial passionless trances, whistling upon their lips, at some order, denying them more repose--since they have a life after their fashion, however faded."[242]

Pulley, who feels he has had some time to assess the disturbing effects of the film-peons upon the viewer, sees their effects as harmful. While he does not explicitly articulate Lewis's point, that the peons are part of an alien medium which distorts perception, he is aware, nevertheless, that the uninitiated viewer will be affected by their presence. He warns Satters not to watch them: "They're a particularly feeble lot--they seem scarcely material. We could almost walk through them! Don't look."[243] Satters, in spite of Pulley's warnings, is the entranced and also incorrigible child:

> "I can't help."
> "I know but when you come across them you ought to make a point of looking away or pretending you don't see them. They'll let you alone then."[244]

Satter's insistence upon watching induces in him the dizziness which accompanies the accelerated stimulation of an isolated sense: "Satters' eyes are attracted to these halted human shells. . . . The bold spanking rhythm of Satters' forward roll degenerates into sluggish pretence, stimulated by his trainer. His vertigo increases as they draw near to the peons. Pullman idles coolly forward, blandly receptive in his Zoo of men, but he says, 'Don't look!' frequently, mistrusting the mysterious inflammability of all more instinctive organisms."[245] The overwhelming stimulation of the unaided eye leaves Satters entirely helpless. A contemporary description of the cinema as "a Juggernaught crushing out mind and perception in one vast orgy of the senses,"[246] captures the sense of what Lewis saw as the forcefulness and immediacy of the impact of the cinema, or the peon-film, upon the unthinking, detached instrument: "The effort to understand is thrown upon the large blue circular eyes entirely: but the blue disk is a simple register; it has been filled with a family of pain-photisms, a hundred odd, it is a nest of vipers absolutely--oh, they are unreal! what are these objects that have got in? signal the muscles of the helpless eye: it distends in alarm; it is nothing but a shocked astonished apparatus, asking itself if it has begun to work improperly."[247] Satters, mesmerized by the visual images, the solitariness of his sense of sight estranging him from the actual, physical environment around him, is helpless in his efforts to respond to sudden changes in the regularity of tactile stimuli. Disoriented by the peon-film, by what Lewis called "this group-mechanism,"[248] he is easily victimized:

> . . . he presses against Pullman, forcing him off the track in panic. At this point it is slightly raised above the surrounding level and they both stumble down. Stubbornly holding his ground, Pullman, asserting himself, butts and rolls the stampeding colossus back upon the footpath.
>
> "We must hold our ground," easily he remarks as he does so, without looking at Satters. "Don't show you're afraid of them whatever you do. Where are your fighting glands? They're quite inoffensive."
>
> Jacking him high and dry with a final hustling bounce, he jumps up beside him.[249]

Lewis immediately continued his description of what he considered to be the consequences following upon the isolation of the visual from the other senses, and depicted still further the nature of such consequences. As Pulley and Satters move along the track once again, and come near enough to the peons to be able to touch them, the two friends are suddenly confronted by one of the screen-folk: "A figure standing out from the others, barring the way of the two interlopers, upon the uncertain track, comes to life. His neck sticks out there is a black flash and a stream of sputum stained with betel-nut strikes Satters upon the cheek."[250] Pulley, anticipating another attack by one of the shadow-people, didactically--and somewhat desperately--provides a label for the incident:

> "You must learn to deal with these fear-neuroses you're a bad case. Look sharp here comes another."
>
> Leaving the shafts of the wheelbarrow where he has stood, an agile figure, leaping from spot to spot, overtakes them in an uneven series of cavorts, drops upon his haunches in their path, and head wagging peers up into Satters' face. Halted once more, Satters stares down: the other continues to roll his head and squint up innocently.
>
> "Take no notice!" Pullman drags at Satters shouting at the peon, "Get back! Go back! What do you think you're doing here, this is not your place! Shadow! go back to your barrow![251]

This time both Pulley and Satters are struck by a similar discharge before the peon, "returning to his immobility,"[252] joins his mechanically-animated fellows. The incident is a parody of the role of the stream-of-consciousness hero. Lewis contended that such a figure, taking all his cues from his mental cinema, cannot cope with extra-visual factors when they assail or assault him.

What we may refer to as the first peon-film of The Childermass suddenly ends, and the peons "become a part of the sodden unsteady phantasm of the past upon the spot. In the course of a minute they have convulsively faded."[253] The peons are temporarily forgotten and--though Satters continues for some time in his trance-like state--for Pullman normal conditions rapidly ensue, and he "reasserts their ordinary solid life-spell in common acts and great homeliness, of housewife-order."[254]

Moments later "Pullman looks back, to discover that the party of peons with whom they have had the encounter is no longer there. . . . [T]hey may not have been there--that unfortunately always has to be reckoned with."[255] Pullman, in making a futile effort to find some continuity between his present and his experience of the peon-film, effectively illustrates Lewis's description in _Time and Western Man_ of the "stream of the Unconscious," a description which applies equally to film. Lewis was here discussing the "intensity, nakedness, . . . of the immediate sensation:" "it gives you no ideal _whole_, . . . it is dogmatically a creature of the moment, . . . it gives you the 'objects' of life only as strictly experienced _in Time_; evanescent, flashing and momentary; . . . ideally having no prolongations in memory, confined to the 'continuous present' of their temporal appearance: consumed (and immediately evacuated) as 'events': one with _action_, incompatible with reflection, impossible of contemplation."[256] Pullman's own lectures, mixed with his repeated warning about the nature of film-creatures, to some extent capture, however weakly, the insights of Lewis' statement on the nature of the immediate sensation: "'You'll soon get used to them. But I recommend you, when you come across them, to pretend you don't see anything at all they don't expect you to see them! Many of them don't know they exist. If you don't take any notice they continue to think they're not there and of course then it's all right. But you mustn't take any notice.'"[257] Pullman's argument reflects to some extent Lewis's preference for the clearly articulated single object.

Upon Satters' prodding and rather hopeful questioning--"'They hardly seem human do they?'"[258]--Pullman continues his attempts at explaining: "'Yes, they are unearthly,' he said. 'What they say about them is that they are the masses of personalities who God, having created them, is unable to destroy, but who are not distinct enough to remain more than what you see. Indistinct ideas don't you know,' he adds loftily."[259] This "God" is Lewis's Bergson who, Lewis wrote in _Time and Western Man_, created a "time-world [which] does not grow, decay, and die, as does the world of physical objects. It is always there: no bergsonian would be able to banish it."[260] Movies, with their mechanical ability to resuscitate endlessly the world they once fixed, are the epitome of such a time-world.

* * *

The individual's manner of interpreting his perceptions or experiences is dependent on, or is affected by, contemporary instruments of research and contemporary mass-media. The refined and specialized perception of the instruments or the media limit and define the individual's range of responses to his perceptual experiences, so that the individual himself may be said to become a product of the instruments or media with which he comes into contact. Lewis explained in Time and Western Man: "reality has been pushed infinitely far away, and the severance between it and us is complete. Both we and it have become abstractions, while between us flourish phantasmally the scenes of the visible world."[261] In The Childermass Satters, in the context of his continued concern regarding his own and Pullman's reality, and through a series of incidents which shall here be outlined, is the adolescent naif who discovers the nature of their reality.

At one point in the novel the scenes of the film-peons are replaced by other phantasmal scenes. Pullman and Satters are described as walking along a track running parallel to the river, at a distance of no more than two hundred yards from it. The heavy fog over the river entirely obscures the view of the city on the other side. Satters, becoming increasingly concerned over Pullman's and his own reality since their unnerving meeting with the blank-eyed peons, asks: "Do you think we should be called distinct Pulley?"[262] Pullman retains his attitude of lecturer, but his explanations grow more elusive, and his warnings become more urgent. As they continue their walk along the track, their distance from the river, over which the fog is lifting somewhat, seems to vary inexplicably. They look in the direction of the copper-red hills which line the track. The hills, the city, and, again, the misty river become part of another film-scene:

> "What are those hills?"
> "Hills? Where? There are no hills. They're nothing!" Pullman crossly exclaims.
> "I didn't know."
> The distance to the city varies; Satters repeatedly looks over, lunging his head to catch it at its changes and at last says:
> "Doesn't that look smaller sometimes?"
> "What?" Pullman looks round indignantly.
> "Sometimes it looks smaller to me than others."
> "Certainly not! Whatever makes you think!"
> The whole city like a film-scene slides away perceptibly several inches to the rear, as their eyes are fixed upon it.
> "Oh that! I don't know, it looks like it. But it isn't so. It's only the atmosphere."[263]

Film-scenes, flourishing in an atmosphere conducive to their existence, again take their toll of tactile correlatives. As the two travellers turn toward the river, "Satters' eyes become fixed upon the city. He trips repeatedly."[264] Pullman responds by reiterating his increasingly anxious warning: "'I do wish you'd stop looking over there,' Miss Pullman scolds. 'It's best not to look; haven't you found that out yet?--most people never do--haven't you noticed?' . . . 'It's unlucky.'"[265]

Sudden tension enters their relationship as Satters, "his face [still staring] in unrecognizing passivity ahead,"[266] begins to question Pullman's evasive but smug displays of insight. Satters shouts back accusingly:

> "I'm not [staring at the city]. You looked. --It was you who looked. I do think you're unfair! I shouldn't have looked if--. . . .
> . . . .
> " . . . Don't you understand are you absolutely

> blind as well as dumb? You march on without speaking as though you were some stupid machine!"[267]

Satters simply bases the analogy between Pullman and a "stupid machine" on the amassed evidence. During their walk Pullman has grown coldly inert to Satters' many questions. On different occasions, for example, "Pulley's face does not register;"[268] "Pullman's ears do not function; he has disconnected them;"[269] "Pullman has apparently heard nothing. Satters wonders if he is a little deaf;"[270] "Pullman proceeds imperturbable, reconnoitring ahead to left and right."[271]

Just when Satters compares Pullman to "some stupid machine" Pulley momentarily drops behind and Satters, picking up momentum, rushes along the track ahead of him. They are confronted suddenly by three peons whose "faces are grey and elementary, their eyes mere discs of verdigris."[272] Satters, ever more perplexed by questions of who is really real, now bravely makes the assertion: "They are scarcely human."[273] Following behind now, Pullman attempts another gesture of warning: "Don't look at them! They are peons."[274] But now, for the first time in the narrative, Pullman himself seems to be subject to the kind of spatial and temporal tentativeness which afflicts the visual images of the film-scenes. Satters does not at this moment look at Pullman, but continues to hear the voice of what is now called the "immaterial guide."[275] Pullman for some time remains hidden to Satters, "blotted in his rear"[276] and "out of sight."[277] When Satters finally does catch a glimpse of Pullman, what he sees is like a film close-up of his face: "he can catch sight of a large face manoeuvring. It is Pullman's head, very large."[278] When Pullman reappears to Satters only a moment later, Satters sees him as if in long-shot: "Pullman is a long way off, a small shapely figure."[279]

Pullman, now constantly peering into a basket he at this time is carrying, hides his eyes from Satters behind the wide brim of the hat he is wearing. As Pullman keeps his head down he and Satters begin to discuss Satters' question about the reality of the images they are perceiving: "What is a peon then, really?"[280] Pullman simply echoes his earlier answer that God has created peons and cannot now destroy them. Considering Satters' question of their own power to create peons, Pullman--"his head is sunk"[281]--offers the suggestion:

> "In your dreams you create all sorts of people. Why not in the other thing?"
> "Why not in the what?"
> "Why, in the other dream."[282]

When Pullman has finally placed the plane of their own existence on the qualitative level of a dream-world, it is left only for Lewis to show how this world affects its inhabitants. After he makes his statement,

> Pulley looks up. Satters gazes into a sallow vacant mask, on which lines of sour malice are disappearing, till it is blank and elementary,

> in fact the face of a clay doll.
>
> "Why, you are a peon!" Satters cries pointedly, clapping his hands.[283]

Pullman strains to recover his original countenance, and "the normal Pulley-mask emerges, but still sallow, battered and stiff-lipped."[284]

Satters, educated in the nature of peon-reality, and suddenly recognizing the kinship between himself and Pulley and the peons, still stubbornly clutches at the remnant of hope that he and Pulley are human beings. His hope, however, has been reduced to desperate and empty rhetoric: "They are human like us, aren't they, in a way, Pulley?"[285] Pullman, with what now is only a futile gesture, maintains: "Not like us."[286] Satters, freshly accommodating himself to his new knowledge, innocently replies with the truth he has discovered: "Not like us? What is the difference? Are we very different? I believe we only think we're so different."[287]

K. THE CHILDERMASS (2): THE CINEMA AND THE REMEMBRANCE OF THINGS PAST

MASS-MAN IS BLIND. HE SEES A STERILIZED REALITY FILTERED THROUGH A DIAPHRAGM OF PHOTOGRAPHS. IF HE EVER SUCCEEDS IN CONCEIVING A NON-PHOTOGRAPHIC AND THEREFORE NON-MORTUARY VISION, IT WILL BE COMPOSED OF ABSTRACT LINES. WHAT IS LACKING IS AN INTERPRETIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HIS EYE AND THE REALITY; THE PHOTOGRAPH HAS DESCENDED LIKE A CATARACT BETWEEN ONE AND THE OTHER. IF THE MASS-MAN FINDS HIMSELF IN A PLACE WHERE BEAUTY THREATENS TO IRRITATE HIM WITH ITS UNREPEATABLE SINGULARITY, HE TAKES A SNAPSHOT WITH HIS CAMERA--THE WEAPON WITH WHICH HE MURDERS UNIQUENESS BY REPRODUCING IT. (Elémire Zolla, 1968)[288]

Though yet unrelated to the overall Lewisian approach to the cinema I have been examining, there is one aspect of cinema which still requires examination--what Lewis called "time-tripping." It is an analogue of Bergsonian mentalism. Lewis discussed this in his polemical work and explored it at length in The Childermass. The mentalism of Bergson, Lewis maintained, threatened the status of what since ancient times had been accepted as a "spatial" present. Thanks to Bergson, Lewis said, "we have indeed *lost our present*: in a bergsonian attempt to crush all the Past into it, and too much of the Future at a time, as well."[289] Time, treated in contemporary thought as though it were a material element--what Lewis called mockingly "the ultimate and supreme reality"[290]--emerges, he charged, as a "*stuff*, the colossal mountain of sheer material . . . --stuffing up and constipating the 'pure Present,' impeding clear-cut living and sane, resolute, 'classical' action, like a rising morass of mud."[291]

Lewis claimed that contemporary philosophers, because they are obsessed with attributing to matter a reality proper to life, have attempted to bring matter to life "by pumping it full of 'time.'"[292] He again turned to the art of the Futurists to illustrate this point: "They were a sort of painting, carving, propaganding ballet or circus, belonging to the milanese showman, Marinetti. One of the tasks he set them was to start making statues that could open and shut their eyes, and even move their limbs and trunks about, or wag their heads. The step from that to a living creature is a small one; and rivalry between the statue and the living puppet could be guaranteed to become rapidly acute."[293]

In the work of a historian like Spengler Lewis saw an insistence that life in its passing contains "some degree of mechanical repetition, of recurrence, of periodicity."[294] Lewis looked upon the Spenglerian as though he were "crawling about a reversible time-region which was fixed, closed-in, . . . as though life consisted entirely in a repetitive, periodic oscillation."[295] Lewis's view of the time-region is unlike his view of the pure present which, he said, invites the play of the spatial intelligence. What the time-region invites is the play of the kind of mentality Lewis distinguished as the time-mind. Man becomes a time-tourist or time-tripper. The "historical" intelligence, Lewis wrote, "does not live in, it is _en touriste_ that it tastes this time-district, or time-climate, and that. This mental world becomes for it an interminable time-preserve, laid out for critical, disembodied journeyings."[296] But how does all this affect the cinema? It becomes increasingly clear as Lewis continued that this "historical" intelligence, when it is widespread, provides an attitude favourable to the success of the cinema as a popular medium. Indeed, the cinema is the best symbol of this intelligence:

> the time-world is a world of images: that is one of the main things to remember about it. . . . In his private time-sense a man can move up and down, backwards and forwards, at will, in his gallery of memory-images. And it is natural at a period where this world of the "inner eye" is stressed, that men, whether physicists or philosophers, would begin constructing systems which are, as it were, dead worlds, laid out endlessly in what we know as Time. In their midst they imagine themselves moving about like sleep-walkers, placing themselves over against quite arbitrary perspectives, but perspectives of a sort of crystallized Time, instead of receding space-vistas. This time-world that they will imaginatively construct will naturally be difficult for the space-sense to imagine: but in effect it will consist of a time-sense _all there at once_, just as a space-sense is; yesterday, _for example_, will be five hundred yards away and in perspective, and last year will be a group of features in the middle distance. It is _we_ who will be moving about in this time-scene. We, in _short_, shall be Time.[297]

As we shall see, Lewis used Pulley and Satters as "globe-trotters" become "time-trippers" in _The Childermass_.

The stream-of-consciousness writers, Lewis claimed, moulded the dead material of the past--a mentalist's material "that is almost more 'physical' than matter"[298]--into a system of truth. They gathered, he claimed, a "suffocating plethora of rubbish . . . within the infinitely extended field of memory."[299] Lewis, having only short patience with writers such as Joyce and Stein in this regard, treated them roughly in Time and Western Man. Of Joyce Lewis said that the dead time-zones of the past are revived by a cinema-like mechanical revivication of them as they are "rolled out" in the present: "he collected like a cistern in his youth the last stagnant pumpings of victorian anglo-irish life. . . . Proust returned to the temps perdu. Joyce never left it. He discharged it as freshly as though the time he wrote about were still present, because it was his present. It rolled out with all the aplomb and vivacity of a contemporary experience, assisted in its slick discharge by the latest technical devices."[300] What could also be defined in terms of film is again defined by the image of the river in Lewis's comment upon Ulysses: "[you will] have had a glut . . . of matter, procured you by the turning on of all this river of what now is rubbish."[301]

The cinema's treatment of reality provided Lewis with the illustration for the easy displacement of time-units. With the cinema actual or fictional large-scale recurrences of the time-periods of the past transform the world into an ongoing "replay" of itself. The sensuous[302] but timeless immediacy of the pure present dissolves in the mentalism of the cinema, in the "series of direct, flat (or not-memory-inflated) impressions:"[303] "it is [the picture of common-sense] for which the cinematograph of the physics of 'events' is to be substituted. . . . [P]eople are to be trained from infancy to regard the world as a moving picture. In this no 'object' would appear, but only the states of an object. . . . If we want to approximate to the discarded view of the percipient of common-sense, we must move round the object, and as far as possible get inside it. With the thousand successive pictures we thus obtain we shall have--only successively, nothing all at once, except a punctual picture and momentary sensation--the perceptual picture of common-sense."[304] The cinema, as vivifier of the mechanically-embalmed events of the past, also satisfies the vogue for replaying the larger time-zones of the past. Lewis wrote scornfully in Time and Western Man: "how . . . impressive would it not be if with the assistance of a gramaphone and domestic cinematograph, or a vocal film, men were, in the future, able to call up at will any people they pleased with the same ease that now a dead film-star, Valentino, for instance, may be publicly resuscitated."[305] Also in Time and Western Man Lewis parodied a possible mechanical restoration of a garden scene of the past.

> A quite credible domestic scene of the future is this. Mr. Citizen and his wife are at the fireside; they release a spring and their selves of long ago fly on to a screen supplied in the Wells-like, or Low-like, Future to all suburban villas. It is a phono-film; it fills the room at once with the cheery laughter of any epoch required. "Let's have that picnic at Hampton Court in such and such a year!" Mrs. Citizen may have exclaimed. "Yes, do let's!" hubby has responded. And they live again the sandwiches, the tea in the thermos, the ginger beer and mosquitoes, of a dozen years before.[306]

* * *

A major portion of The Childermass is devoted to Lewis's fictional construction of the kind of time-world which he had described especially in Time and Western Man, where he had said: "We can posit a time-district, as it were, just as much as we can a place with its individual physical properties."[307] In Monstre Gai, a subsequent novel of his trilogy, The Human Age, Lewis himself stressed that the cinematograph was the model for the time-district, or time-trap, or time-hallucination, of The Childermass. In Monstre Gai Pullman recalls his and Satters' experience of this event in the transit camp of The Childermass: "He began thinking of the time in the camp. He remembered how Time had its traps there; he had got into a scene of two hundred years ago--like turning a cinematograph backwards and holding it rigid."[308]

In The Childermass, as Pullman and Satters, having lost sight of the river, are searching anxiously for it, a large picture suddenly and inexplicably appears before them.

It is, Pullman knowingly and reassuringly tells Satters, only a "time-hallucination:" "'It's nothing at all really. It's a time-hallucination--we don't get them often but I've seen several. I daresay it has not much depth, perhaps none, perhaps a few yards--time-yards, I mean! You see how the wind stops in front of us?' He thrusts his hand out. 'That's about as far as it goes.'"[309] To walk through this quite static picture should not, Pulley guesses, take more than a few minutes. Close scrutiny reveals no sign of life among the inhabitants of the time-hallucination. These are not dressed as peons but as figures of an England of the past: "Nothing seems to be moving on its surface, their four eyes report, ranging and ratting round in all its corners. It is a little faded like a very much enlarged rustic colour-print."[310] Or, it is similar to an enlargement of a single frame of an historical movie. Like Lewis's film-age man, Pullman and Satters enter the time-scene, en touriste.

Pullman is quite at ease in the changed environment. "I like other dimensions!" he says. "I feel ridiculously at home."[311] Pullman recognizes that Satters is having considerable difficulty in trying to change from his old-world ways to those demanded by the stimuli of the new world: "You must get a method, that is essential. . . . The trouble is you haven't properly got clear of your old life. It's a common case. I should say you belonged first and foremost to the human dimension, however."[312] Pullman explains that one must adapt to the electrical/magnetic basis to fully appreciate the new system: "The magnetism out here again requires stamina of a particular sort; at bottom it's electricity all the way through magnetic and electric, this is all nothing but that."[313]

Pullman proudly continues to point out what he has come to see as some of the remarkable features of the "time-spaces," as he often calls them, and through which he travels with delight. In a statement recalling Lewis's description of time-regions as fixed, closed-in, and reversible,[314] Pullman says without any sign of Lewisian regret: "Reversibility is the proof that the stage of perfection has been reached in machine-construction--it's the same with us, in my opinion. Here we are going backwards aren't we?"[315]

Pullman talks on about what Lewis would have called Time's constipation of the simple present. Multiple time and the dissolution of spatial references occur here as in dreams: "when you're in one you're in the other."[316] What Pullman refers to as "revisiting the glimpses" can occur in a vague system where there is often, as he says, "nothing to go by, near and far are very relative."[317] The solidity of physical space breaks down; Pullman acknowledges about the effects of the time-hallucination: "It's most remarkable how two times can be made to fit into one space and that only a functional one; no one can call this physical except by courtesy or for convenience."[318]

As Pullman and Satters walk into the chronological or, as Pullman calls it, "durational" depth of the picture--"We're two hundred years back that's what we are now"[319]--they note its diminishing, camera-eye perspective. They, however, retain their size along the time-vista, and finally discover themselves to be Gullivers to the Lilliputians who seem to pose delicately and lifelessly at their feet.

In underlining his concern with the effects of technologies such as the cinema, Lewis here again depicted particular aspects of what he saw as the result of man's exposure to such technologies. He satirized Pullman's and Satters' smugness with regard to their feelings of being uniquely life-like or at least superior in relation to the inert and increasingly diminutive creatures of the time-hallucination. And as upon the occasion of Pulley's and Satters' encounter with the peons, he again incorporated into his satire a parody of what follows upon the estrangement of the tactile and the visual senses.

In the midst of the time-hallucination Satters, as upon the earlier occasion of the peon-film, poses his question concerning the nature of the reality of the inhabitants of the time-regions: "What would happen if they all came to life suddenly?"[320] Then, shortly before the time-scene runs its course, Satters, anxious to experiment with touch, molests one of three small figures standing about a table in the garden of an inn by grasping it with a mischievous wrench. The tactile embrace has immediate repercussions, as the little figure, hitherto part of a static world only visually perceived by Pulley's and Satters' combined "four eyes," comes to life and counter-attacks: "A sharp howl goes up from Satters as the teeth of this refractory monad are fleshed in his hand, and he drops it stamping with pain, both hands tightly squeezed between his legs."[321] Having touched when the situation demanded that he should only have looked, Satters is still in pain when the time-scene is suddenly extinguished: "[a] large helpless woman in distress, Satters . . . holds his left hand in his right."[322]

Just prior to the end of the time-hallucination, Satters brutally slays the little figure, whose only crime was to bite his finger and to call him a lout. Here Lewis provided an illustration of the effects of mind-distortion concomitant with sense-distortion: "in a few strides Satters is up with the fugitive and with a flying kick dashes it forward upon its face, then before Pullman can reach him the football stogies are trampling it in an ecstasy of cruelty beneath them into an inert flattened mass."[323] Although the new inertness of the body parallels, grotesquely, the attractive inertness which preceded its destruction, the crushed body is mock-witness to the superiority of the "real" people to those in the cinema-like picture.

The ending of the brightly-lit time-hallucination evokes, in simple terms, the sense of a movie ending: "the light is extinguished in a black flash."[324] There is an immediate loss of the tyrannical exclusiveness of visual stimulation, and simultaneous regrouping of inter-sensual functions, which create for Pulley and Satters an inner environment calling for quick mental and motor re-orientations. With the conclusion of the "film" the two "are flung upon their faces as the road rises to meet them. They get up it seems almost immediately, breathless, but the time-scene has vanished."[325] Appropriately, the river, the "real thing," which they had been seeking prior to the time-hallucination, now appears before them as they pick themselves off the road. The Bergsonian flux/stream provides the underlying continuity of experience along the episodic route of their adventures.

L. THE PHOENIX: REBIRTH IN THE AGE OF THE CINEMA

> THE CINEMA SUPPLIES [MAN] WITH ALREADY FINISHED FANTASIES, NOT DENIED BY THE IRONY THAT ALWAYS ACCOMPANIES THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE YEARNED-FOR IDEAL AND THE REALITY (THE REGAL MANTLE CAUSES ONE TO TRIP, THE PROCESSION IS BORING, THE SCISSORS WON'T CUT THE RIBBON, A HEADACHE TWISTS ONE'S SMILE INTO A SILLY GRIMACE). BY IDENTIFYING HIMSELF WITH THE "SUCCESSFUL" MAN ON THE SCREEN, THE MOVIE ADDICT IS EXEMPTED FROM ALL THE PAIN CONNECTED WITH TRANSFORMING HIS DESIRE INTO AN IMAGE. (Elémire Zolla, 1968)[326]

Man's need for renewal within the context of the technological environment, Lewis was saying, is desperate. In The Childermass the mechanics of rebirth are regularly simulated by means suited to the shallowness of media-produced man, and actual rebirth never really occurs. In the internment camp the coming of the Phoenix, the symbol of rebirth, is arranged as part of an impressive cinema spectacle. Pulley and Satters and other occupants of the transit camp watch a mirage/film-show which flashes on the other side of the river, where the walls of the magnetic city are normally seen. It is, most viewers agree, a slick picture of Babylon five thousand years ago: "'Oh look! That must be Babylon! I've seen it on the pictures.'"[327] The occasion, a technologically-contemporary celebration of the return of the Phoenix, is accompanied once again by the mechanical reiteration of Pulley's warnings as he vigilantly continues his role as intrepid guardian:

> "It's getting worse," he says. "I shouldn't stare too much if I were you. It's a great strain on the eyes.
>
> . . . .
>
> "I recommend you to stop looking. It might permanently affect your eyes."[328]

Some of the more perceptive viewers explicitly identify the nature of the picture shining before them, although others vaguely disagree:

> "It's a cinematograph!"
> "No, it's not a cinematograph."
> "Very well have it your own way!"[329]

The narrator refers to it as a "phantom picture"[330] to be watched "upon the turning down of the lights."[331] When the show is over the Bailiff confirms the opinion that it was indeed a cinema show: "They always do that film business when the Phoenix comes. It's quite pretty, but as archaeology it's all nonsense I'm afraid. I hope you enjoyed it?"[332]

The continued flippant tone of the Bailiff's words, taken in view of his embarrassed awareness of the farcical nature of the periodical return of the Phoenix, and the cynical superficiality of subsequent interchanges with his fawning audience, encompass the essence of the mentality of which Lewis was most critical in his own day:

> ". . . that tiresome bird . . . makes all that fuss about its stupid nest every time it lays itself again or whatever it is that it does, as though that could be of any interest to any one but itself or perhaps the dynasty of Noah! Why it should suppose that the feathering of its stuffy ill-smelling

> nest is so attractive and worthy of celebration or why it should regard its eternal reproduction of its ill-favoured self as a sign of God's favour baffles me: but there, you know the saying about people being taken at their own valuation!--it's only a bird, after all, a mere bird, we must excuse it--if it were a man that would be different--but then it would know better, would it not?"
>
> "Please, sir, is it a real bird?" . . . .
>
> "No, not real but quite real enough." . . . .[333]

"Not real but quite real enough" not only describes the bird but also defines what Lewis saw as the limits of the possibilities for man's rebirth in the context of the mechanical dream-environment he inhabits. This definition satisfies the residents of the environment who, like Satters, only temporarily cling to hopes that the new condition carries with it the vestiges of a traditional reality, of what Lewis saw as a pre-Bergson and pre-cinema reality. It is a definition which takes on a compounded meaning in our own day.

NOTES

PART ONE

[1] Stein, *Lectures in America*, 177.

[2] Lindsay, *The Art of the Moving Picture*, 229.

[3] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [I]", 36.

[4] A. W., "Finis", 80. Rachael Low has speculated that the attitude of conservative inflexibility toward the cinema significantly nullified serious attempts at artistic achievement among many British film makers: "If films had been socially accepted as an outlet for imaginative impulses as readily as they were, for example, in America more talent might well have been attracted by the new medium of expression for its own sake. One is left with the impression that in Britain the film had to overcome the resistance of a particularly inelastic social and intellectual pattern." (Low, *The History of the British Film, 1906-1914*, 138)

[5] Humphrey, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*, 49.

[6] Mendilow, *Time and the Novel*, 53-54. In the introduction to Mendilow's study Professor J. Isaacs wrote concerning a section on fiction and the other arts in Mendilow's work: "The most promising direction in which profit might be found is the relation between the novel and the cinema, for the cinema is the form, the art-form peculiarly of our own day, which has conquered time. The whole business of *montage* is common to both arts." (Isaacs, in Mendilow, *Time and the Novel*, VII)

[7] Ryf, *A New Approach to Joyce*, 177.

[8] Neither of two other significant studies of film and literature--Claude-Edmonde Magny's *The Age of the American Novel: The Film Aesthetic of Fiction Between the*

Wars (1948; tr. 1972) and George Bluestone's *Novels Into Film: The Metamorphosis of Fiction into Cinema* (1957)--attempts to consider the relationship between a writer's personal film aesthetic and its influence on his fiction.

[9] Sinclair, "The Novels of Dorothy Richardson", 58.

[10] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, VI: The Increasing Congregation", 63.

[11] See the *Letters of James Joyce*, 45. In his chapter on Joyce and the cinema Murray has written: "The Volta Theater, located at 45 Mary Street, opened on December 20, 1909 with a program of Italian films--*The First Paris Orphanage*, *The Tragic Story of Beatrice Cenci* and the like--which were well-received by the newspaper reviewers. But it is difficult to see how Joyce (the question of the medium's technical possibilities to one side here) could have been greatly impressed by the fare; at any rate, after ten days of supervision he left the Volta in charge of an associate and returned to Trieste." (Murray, *The Cinematic Imagination*, 124-125)

[12] See: Levin, *James Joyce*, 88-89; Murray, *The Cinematic Imagination*, 4-5; and Ryf, *A New Approach to Joyce*, 174-175.

[13] Lewis, *Rude Assignment*, 129.

[14] Lewis, *Self Condemned*, 89-90. The statement is made by Robert Parkinson, one of the characters in *Self Condemned*, who is reading his article on René Harding, "A Historian who is anti-History," to René. The view, however, is Lewis's, and he expressed it several times in his work.

[15] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, XII: The Cinema in Arcady", 57.

[16] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, VI: The Increasing Congregation", 63-64. Elsewhere Richardson noted: "It is not possible perfectly to disentangle from that of the wireless, the popular newspaper and the gramaphone, the influence of the cinema." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, XII: The Cinema in Arcady", 55)

[17] H. D., "Russian Films", 20.

[18] Low, The History of the British Film, 1906-1914, 51-54.

[19] Taylor, English History, 1914-1945, 181.

[20] Knight, The Liveliest Art, 49.

[21] Bryher, The Heart to Artemis, 246. It was Bryher's opinion in 1962 that, despite enormous technical advances, "the life has gone from modern films, they are seldom creative, but have become what we prided ourselves should be avoided, photographed theater. They do not 'move.'" (Bryher, The Heart to Artemis, 248)

[22] Low, The History of the British Film, 1918-1929, 34.

[23] Ibid., 34. Low was quoting Stuart Davis, manager of the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion Cinema.

[24] Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 387-392; and Knight, The Liveliest Art, 59, 62. The bracketed dates indicate the year the film was first released. It is interesting to read the reactions of novelists to specific films. Dorothy Richardson, after having seen The Student of Prague at the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion, wrote in 1929 that this film "joined forces with the few 'good' films [she had] seen at home and abroad in convincing [her] that the film can be an 'art-form.'" (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", 54) Malcolm Lowry wrote about The Street, as well as Murnau's first American film, Sunrise (1927): "Nor has anything I have read influenced my own writing personally more than the first twenty minutes of Murnau's Sonnenaufgang or the last shots of Karl Gruene's The Street." (Lowry, Unpublished letter to ten Holder)

[25] Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 393.

[26] Knight, The Liveliest Art, 60.

[27] Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Alexandrov, "A Statement", 258-259. Jay Leyda noted in an editorial comment: "This historic collective 'Statement,' generally assumed to have been initiated and composed by the first of its three signatories and endorsed by the other two, first appeared in the Leningrad magazine, Zhizn Iskusstva, on August 5,

1928. All previous English texts have been translated from a German publication of the statement later in that month." (Leyda, in Eisenstein, "A Statement", 259-260) One of the texts to which Leyda must have been referring appeared in Close Up in October, 1928.

[28] Ibid., 258-259.

[29] Isaacs, An Assessment of Twentieth-Century Literature, 182-183. Some of the production details of the silent films to which Isaacs made reference and which have not already been mentioned are: Eisenstein's and Alexandrov's The General Line (Russia, 1926-1929); Pudovkin's Storm Over Asia (Russia, 1928); Dovjenko's Earth (Russia, 1930); and Arthur Robison's Warning Shadows (Germany, 1922).

[30] Tolstoy, "[Conversation concerning the future of the cinema]", 4. Tolstoy continued enthusiastically in his consideration of the cinema: "I rather like it. This swift change of scene, this blending of emotion and experience--it is much better than the heavy, long-drawn-out kind of writing to which we are accustomed. It is closer to life. In life, too, changes and transitions flash by before our eyes, and emotions of the soul are like a hurricane. The cinema has divined the mystery of motion. And that is greatness. . . . [T]he films! They are wonderful! Drr! and a scene is ready! Drr! and we have another! We have the sea, the coast, the city, the palace--. . . . I am seriously thinking of writing a play for the screen." (Tolstoy, "[Conversation]", 4)

[31] We may recall that Wells and Shaw were among the founding members of the London Film Society. Stuart Davis, manager of the Shaftesbury Avenue Pavilion, has noted, while referring to a Gala Performance on the opening night in 1929 of a series of silent films, that "a large number of notabilities were present, including H. G. Wells, Arnold Bennett. . . ." (Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 391) Dorothy Richardson recalled in 1929 that Wells "was amongst the first film-fans, Chaplin-fans. One of the first to see some of the possibilities. . . ." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 31)

[32] While both shared with Woolf the awareness of the contemporary ascendancy of the subjective in art, it was Richardson who concurred with Woolf, while Lewis diametrically opposed her. Taking note of Woolf's reaction against the traditional realism of Wells, Bennett, and Galsworthy

in her justifying the new fictional emphasis, Walter Allen has commented upon Woolf's preferences: "It was just such a novel that Dorothy Richardson had already been writing for almost a decade." (Allen, "Introduction", in Pilgrimage, 5)

[33] Woolf, "Modern Fiction", 185.

[34] Ibid., 190-191.

[35] Woolf, "The Movies and Reality", 308-310. The same essay was published as "The Cinema" in The Nation and Athenaeum, July 3, 1926, pp. 381-383.

[36] Woolf, "Modern Fiction", 188.

[37] Woolf, "The Movies and Reality", 308.

[38] Ibid., 308.

[39] Ibid., 308.

[40] Ibid., 309.

[41] Ibid., 310.

[42] Ibid., 310.

[43] About a month following the appearance of Woolf's essay Gilbert Seldes noted that Woolf's desire for "something abstract" in the cinema "is apparently written without knowledge of the abstract films which have been made in Paris in the last two or three years, films which already make the conditional future unnecessary. At least a part of the films of tomorrow will be composed of the elements Mrs. Woolf mentions." (Seldes, "The Abstract Movie", 95) Seldes was thinking specifically of films such as René Clair's Entr'acte (1924). It was not until a few years after Woolf's essay that Un chien andalou (1928), by Luis Buñuel and Salvador Dali, appeared.

[44] Woolf, "The Movies and Reality", 309.

[45] Ibid., 309.

[46] Ibid., 309.

[47] Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 359.

[48] Ibid., 378. Galsworthy, expressing only a "tolerance" for the silent film, said that the talkies, of the three or four he had seen by then, appealed to him even less: "They have seemed to me silent films spoiled." He wrote with insight that the film had "a very real and rather dangerous power of holding the eye even at its worst. It could sway you while you looked on, but when you came away (with the rarest exceptions) you were wholly unmoved. And this . . . was partly because you were conscious of its enormous faking power, and partly because the eye was held at such a pace that the mind did not stir in concord." (Galsworthy, in Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 378)

Carter quoted a letter from Galsworthy concerning the number of film versions of his works: "Silent films have been made of 'Justice' (1913), 'Fair,' 'The Skin Game' (1920), 'Quite Good,' 'The First and the Last' (about 1921). Terribly bad, I believe. The novel 'The White Monkey' (about 1924) even worse, I believe. No talking films as yet." Carter noted that since Galsworthy had written the letter, dated October 29, 1930, his play, "Escape," had been made into a talkie. (Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 375)

[49] Carter provided the following list which he obtained from Bennett: Milestones; The Great Adventure; The Grand Babylon Hotel; Sacred and Profane Love; The Card; The Old Wives' Tale; City of Pleasure; Sinews of War; Death, Fire and Life. Bennett also wrote the film scripts for movies entitled Piccadilly (1928) and Punch and Judy (1928). (Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 376)

[50] Bennett, "The Film 'Story'", 30. While granting Americans the leadership technically and commercially in the cinema, Bennett maintained that aesthetically the American film--with the exception of Chaplin--was entirely impoverished: "I consider that America has no artistic importance whatever in the world of the cinema. . . . I have never--Chaplin's work apart--seen a good American film. I have rarely seen one that was not artistically revolting. Not one of the American directors has left a permanent mark on film history, or produced anything that would not deeply grieve the judicious.

I must specially except Charles Chaplin, who, in addition to being a great actor, is a great producer. 'The Gold Rush', while not perfect in some essential matters, was a great film. It would bear seeing twice.

The future of the films it seems to me to be in Germany. I have seen dreadful German films. One of the silliest and worst was 'Metropolis'. But I have seen two relatively good ones, 'The Last Laugh' and, still better, 'Vaudeville'." (Bennett, "The Film 'Story'", 27-28)

[51] Wells, The King who was a King, 15.

[52] Ibid., 10.

[53] Richardson, "Talkies, plays, and books", 56.

[54] Wells, The King who was a King, 25.

[55] Ibid., 21.

[56] Ibid., 248-249.

[57] Shaw, "The Drama, the Theatre, and the Films", 293. Rachael Low has candidly summarized Wells' script: "his approach was highly intellectual and verbal, and after outlining a veritable sermon of a story in the introduction he proceeded to present it in such a way as to suggest that he had little understanding of film as visual story-telling. His use of sound, also, was merely additional, and it is hard to believe that with this attitude to it he could really have seen sound as a turning point in the cinema. The action is designed throughout as a silent film with montages and elaborate silent film symbols, packing the unwieldy message into the many long, wordy and literary titles and the use of words superimposed on pictures; faces and illustrative actions were to be incidental and the sound track used only for music and effects." (Low, The History of the British Film, 1918-1929, 242)

[58] Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 359.

[59] Shaw, "My First Talkie", 204. The screening of How He Lied to Her Husband occurred during the Malvern Festival of Shaw's plays. Donald Costello has written: "By 1921 Shaw reported that he turned down ten-thousand-pound movie offers 'about three times a week.'" (Costello, The Serpent's Eye, 25) As early as 1927 Shaw had written, according to Bernard Dukore, who has written an introduction to the book, Saint Joan: A Screenplay by Bernard Shaw, a film script for a film-and-record experiment of the Cathedral scene from Saint Joan. (Dukore, Saint Joan, xi)

Later film scripts by Shaw were for movie versions of the following of his plays: How He Lied to Her Husband (1931); Arms and the Man (1932); Pygmalion (1938); Major Barbara (1941); Caesar and Cleopatra (1945). (Dukore, Saint Joan, 141-142) Shaw's screenplays of The Devil's Disciple and Saint Joan, both written during the 1930's, were never made into films. (Dukore, Saint Joan, xvi, xxxiv)

[60] Ibid., 205.

[61] Ibid., 205.

[62] Shaw, "The Drama, the Theatre, and the Films", 293-294.

[63] George, "A Painter's Literature", 224. George included also Joseph Conrad among the "Neo-Victorians." He also mentioned in passing the group of writers whom he called "Edwardians." Among these he included J. D. Beresford, D. H. Lawrence, Hugh Walpole, Frank Swinnerton, Compton Mackenzie, and E. M. Forster.

[64] Ibid., 224. George also included Romer Wilson and May Sinclair among the "Neo-Georgians." Tarr, Lewis's first novel, was the only Lewis work under consideration by George. All of Lewis's later novels reflect his aesthetic-philosophic estrangement from the writers with whom George grouped him.

[65] Ibid., 228.

[66] Ibid., 231.

[67] Ibid., 233. George made an exception of Woolf: "Mrs. Woolf is a complete writer, for she combines the intellectual outlook with the pictorial sense." (George, "A Painter's Literature", 233)

[68] Ibid., 234.

[69] George, "W. L. George", 126.

[70] George, "A Painter's Literature", 226.

[71] Jones, The Dramatic Imagination, 17-18.

[72] Lewis, The Wild Body, 238.

[73] Stephenson and Debrix, *The Cinema as Art*, 214.

[74] Murray, *The Cinematic Imagination*, 172.

[75] Lewis, *The Mysterious Mr. Bull*, 90.

[76] Gessner, *The Moving Image*, 17.

[77] Langer, "A Note on Film", 415. Langer was here quoting from R. E. Jones' *The Dramatic Imagination*, p. 18.

[78] Ibid., 415.

[79] Ibid., 412.

[80] Ibid., 414. In a footnote Langer quoted Eisenstein: "the spectator is drawn into a creative act in which his individuality is not subordinated to the author's individuality, but is opened up throughout the process of fusion with the author's intention, just as the individuality of a great actor is fused with the individuality of a great playwright in the creation of a classic scenic image. In fact, every spectator . . . creates an image in accordance with the representational guidance, suggested by the author, leading him to understanding and experience of the author's theme. This is the same image that was planned and created by the author, but this image is at the same time created also by the spectator himself." (Eisenstein, in Langer, "A Note on Film", 414)

[81] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, V: There's No Place Like Home", 45.

[82] Langer, "A Note on Film", 413.

[83] Deer, "Strindberg's Dream Vision", 253.

[84] Beach, *The Twentieth-Century Novel*, 409.

[85] Ibid., 409. Emil Jannings, the German actor, was the central figure in Murnau's film, *The Last Laugh* (Germany, 1924).

[86] Ibid., 525.

[87] Ibid., 525.

[88] Ibid., 525.

[89] Humphrey, *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*, 50.

[90] Levin, James Joyce, 88. See also the chapter, "Joyce's Visual Imagination," in Ryf's *A New Approach to Joyce*.

[91] Eisenstein, *Film Form*, 105.

[92] Ibid., 184-185.

[93] Ibid., 104. Eisenstein's and Alexandrov's *October* had been released in 1928. Ivor Montagu, referring to Eisenstein's reference to Joyce's request to see his films, has stated that "because of his near blindness" the screening could not be made possible. (Montagu, *Eisenstein in Hollywood*, 29)

[94] Ibid., 104. Eisenstein continued: "Literature's most brilliant achievement in this field has been the immortal 'inner monologues' of Leopold Bloom in *Ulysses*." (Eisenstein, *Film Form*, 104)

[95] Lowry, *Selected Letters*, 192.

[96] Lowry, "Preface to a Novel", 28.

[97] Lowry, *Under the Volcano*, 266.

[98] Lowry, *October Ferry to Gabriola*, 132.

[99] Eliot, "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock", 14.

[100] Lowry, *October Ferry to Gabriola*, 133.

[101] Lowry, *Dark as the Grave Wherein My Friend is Laid*, 249.

[102] Lowry, "Tender is the Night" (unpublished film script), 83.

[103] Ibid., 84-85.

[104] Edward Murray in 1972 listed the following Robbe-Grillet films: Last Year at Marienbad (1961); The Immortal Woman (1962); Trans-Europ-Express (1968); The Man Who Lies (1969); and Eden and After (1970). (Murray, The Cinematic Imagination, 285)

[105] Robbe-Grillet, For a New Novel, 149.

[106] Ibid., 156.

[107] Shattuck, The Banquet Years, 341-342.

[108] McLuhan, Understanding Media, 258.

[109] Morrissette, "Cinema and Literature", 232.

[110] Ibid., 234.

[111] Morrissette, "Surfaces and Structures in Robbe-Grillet's Novels", 10.

[112] Morrissette, "Cinema and Literature", 231.

PART TWO

[1] Isherwood, Lions and Shadows, 86.

[2] Artaud, "The Shell and the Clergyman", 65.

[3] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, VI: The Increasing Congretation", 61-62.

[4] Although Richardson herself did not contribute to each issue, Close Up appeared monthly from July 1927 to December 1930. From 1931 to 1933 it was published only quarterly, but in a somewhat enlarged and more profusely illustrated format. Attracting writers associated with innovative literary movements, it provided a forum for serious discussion of the cinema.

Bryher, who married Kenneth Macpherson, editor of Close Up, in 1927, wrote in 1962: "Close Up was born on a capital of sixty pounds. We expected it to last three issues and had five hundred copies printed. It was an immediate success and when we ended after the collapse of the silent film, six years later, we had five thousand readers. . . . Switzerland was a perfect place for our headquarters. It was possible to see French, German, American and English films all in the same week." (Bryher, The Heart to Artemis, 245-246)

The tone of Huntly Carter's description of Close Up contrasts with that of Bryher and of Richardson. He wrote in 1930: "The Film Society and 'Close Up' clique have always done their best to convey the impression that they are obsessed far more with technique than with social content. Indeed it is doubtful whether the leaders and members of these two groups have any knowledge of sociology and the transformation which present-day society is undergoing. Their game is quite plainly to promote the idea that the moving picture must be detached from actuality and infuse it with a new aesthetic having nothing whatever to do with actual fact or a life-centred society." (Carter, The New Spirit in the Cinema, 290)

[5] Richardson, "Seven Letters to Dorothy Richardson [1950-1951]", 108.

[6] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, V: There's No Place Like Home", 44.

[7] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IX: The Thoroughly Popular Film", 44.

[8] Ibid., 46.

[9] Ibid., 46.

[10] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [I]", 36.

[11] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", 53-54.

[12] Ibid., 56.

[13] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IX: The Thoroughly Popular Film", 44.

[14] Ibid., 45.

[15] Ibid., 45.

[16] Ibid., 45.

[17] Richardson wrote in 1928: "there is an epithet, a single word, half awestruck and respectful, half hilariously mocking, coined in the largest nursery of the new civilisation, by some citizen of the lower world wandered by chance into alien territory: highbrow." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IX: The Thoroughly Popular Film", 46)

[18] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IX: The Thoroughly Popular Film", 46-47.

[19] Ibid., 47. Some months later Richardson again insisted that "welcome for the FILM does not by any means imply repudiation of the movies. The FILM at its utmost possible development can no more invalidate the movies than the first-class portrait . . . can invalidate a snap-shot." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [VIII]: Pictures and Films", 55)

[20] Richardson, "Confessions", 71. The entire paragraph reads: "The cinema. Cafés. Any street. Any garden. Mornings. Sundays. Brown bread and Cornish butter. Soap. The cinema. Onions. Split greengages. Cigars. Berkshire bacon. The cinema. Münich Lager. Conversation. Dry champagne. Planter's punch. Gilbert and Sullivan. Bach. Antheil. Bach. Wagner. Beethoven. Beethoven. Beethoven. Bach. Bach. The cinema. Quaker meetings." (Richardson, "Confessions", 71)

[21] Ibid., 71.

[22] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IV: A Thousand Pities", 63-64.

[23] Richardson, "Talkies, Plays and Books", 56.

[24] Ibid., 56.

[25] Ibid., 56.

[26] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 34.

[27] Ibid., 36. Richardson wrote comically: "If, beside the film grown solid and sounding the silent magic lantern show persists as we are told it will. . . . But will it, for example pay? Is it not already old-fashioned? We are reminded of a lady who remarked on hearing that Paderewski had played 'The Bee's Wedding', 'That old thing? Why Winnie could play that when she was eight!' Alas, alas, alas." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 36-37.

[28] Richardson, "Talkies, Plays and Books", 56.

[29] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 32.

[30] Ibid., 33.

[31] Ibid., 33.

[32] Richardson, "Talkies, Plays and Books", 56.

[33] Anon, "Novels", 474. The writer of this article, which includes a review of Interim (1919), also pointed out that there are stylistic analogies between Richardson's work and that of Joyce, and that there are traits in her work which reflect the practice and theory of the Futurists. Wyndham Lewis frequently linked both Joyce and the Futurists to the cinema.

[34] Murry, "The Break-Up of the Novel", 298.

[35] Hyde, "The Work of Dorothy Richardson", 511.

[36] Anon, "Miss Richardson's New Novel", 403. This article is a review of Deadlock (1921).

[37] Anon, "The Tunnel", 331

[38] Collins, "Dorothy Richardson and her Censor", 100.

[39] Maisel, "Dorothy M. Richardson's Pilgrimage", 89.

[40] Wagenknecht, Cavalcade of the English Novel, 507-508.

[41] Edel, "Novels of Influence", 743. Edel was quoting from the last few lines of *Pointed Roofs* (1915). It should be noted that Edel's suggestion that Richardson "anticipated" the moving picture is erroneous, if only at the factual level. Richardson rather "mimed" the moving picture camera in her fiction.

[42] Glicken, "Dorothy M. Richardson: The Personal 'Pilgrimage'", 596.

[43] Richardson wrote in 1933: "the war finds one with the first chapter written of a long, long book, and the second begun, and the third in shape, one is therefore, when the time comes, incensed in being classified as a post-war writer altogether." (Richardson, "Beginnings", 198) In 1943 she wrote: "The first chapter-volume of *Pilgrimage*, begun in 1913, was finished just before the outbreak of war. Various publishers refused it and it finally appeared in the autumn of 1915." (Richardson, "Data for Spanish Publisher", 9)

[44] Miller, "The Red Herring", 5.

[45] Richardson, "The Artist and the World To-day", 94.

[46] Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562.

[47] Ibid., 562.

[48] Ibid., 562.

[49] Ibid., 562.

[50] Even in life Richardson resisted the principle of the "conducted tour" which raised in her the suspicion of ulterior motives. The army of social welfare personnel who brought aid to the needy were forced by the nature of their work to direct or interfere with the lives of others in order to survive themselves. Even "those whose labours are carried on in the spirit of an invitation to the dance of life" were suspect in Richardson's opinion: "Contact with them may be for the lost a tour of paradise; but it is a conducted tour." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, X: The Cinema in the Slums", 60)

Richardson did acknowledge that, indeed, every novel like any work of art must be considered, in one sense, a conducted tour; that is, a conducted tour "first and foremost into the personality of the author who, willy-nilly, and whatever be his method of approach, must present the reader with the writer's self-portrait." (Richardson, "Novels", 190) Thus, even when a writer "projects his material on a screen," he is nevertheless in one sense quite visible; "present, if we seek him, only in the attitude towards reality, inevitably revealed: subtly by his accent, obviously by his use of adjective, epithet, and metaphor." (Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562)

Similarly, of course, any film, even one without sub-titles or vocal sound, is really a self-portrait of the artist who, ultimately, "can no more eliminate the caption than he can eliminate himself. . . . A work of pure fantasy bears its caption within." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 55).

[51] Richardson, "Data for Spanish Publisher", 19.

[52] Richardson, "Foreword [1938]", 11.

[53] Ibid., 11.

[54] Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562. In an essay in 1948 Richardson provided a similar set of alternatives, although she added a third, intermediate one. The author, she wrote, "may face his audience after the manner of a lecturer, tell his tale, interpolate the requisite information, descriptions, explanations; or, walking at his side, letting the tale tell itself, come forward now and again to make a comment or drive home a point; or, remaining out of sight and hearing may, so to speak, project his material upon a screen." (Richardson, "Novels", 190-191)

[55] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 56.

[56] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", 184-185. Richardson wrote in 1929: "the snap-shot [like the movie] . . . is food for all. It can't go wrong. It is innocent, and its results go straight to the imagination of the onlooker, the collaborator, the other half of the game.

The charm of the first movies was in their innocence. . . . Like the snap-shot, they recorded, . . . the snap-shot records what are always and everywhere food for a discriminating and undiscriminating humanity alike." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", 55-56)

[57] Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562.

[58] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", 184-185.

[59] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [I]", 36.

[60] Ibid., 36-37. Richardson added that "though a good orchestra can heighten and deepen effects, a piano played by one able to improvise connective tissue for his varying themes is preferable to most orchestral accompaniments." In a later essay Richardson cited the case of a poorly conducted orchestra which in her opinion brought about a "destruction of the relationship between onlookers and film." She was quick to add, however, that "any kind of musical noise is better than none." She said too that she once had endured an occasion when an orchestra had failed to appear, "and the pictures moved silently by, lifeless and colourless, to the sound of intermittent talking and the continuous faint hiss and creak of the apparatus." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, II: Musical Accompaniment", 60)

[61] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, II: Musical Accompaniment", 61

[62] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 55-56.

[63] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 36.

[64] Ibid., 31.

[65] Vocal sound, said Richardson, is more likely to be "dramatic" than "cinematographic." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 217)

[66] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 214-215.

[67] Ibid., 215.

[68] Ibid., 215. "Music and song," Richardson--remaining consistent with her earlier statements--continued, "demand only a distributed hearing which works directly as enhancement rather than diminution of the faculty of seeing.

But concentrated listening is immediately fatal to cinematography." In another essay in 1930 Richardson improvised a theorem which she applied to the talkie: "it is impossible both to hear and to see, to the limit of our power of using these faculties, at one and the same moment." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVI]: A Tear for Lycidas", 198)

[69] Ibid., 216. While the poor quality of the sound and the noise of the projector must have reinforced her opinions, Richardson maintained that even if "the technical difficulties of speech are ultimately overcome, the results, like the results of the addition to silent film of any kind of realistic sound, will always be disastrous. No spoken film will ever be able to hold a candle to silent drama, will ever be so 'speaking.'" (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 216)

[70] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, IV: A Thousand Pities", 62.

[71] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, V: There's No Place Like Home", 46.

[72] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVI]: A Tear for Lycidas", 199. One of Wyndham Lewis's main arguments against the cinema and against the stream-of-consciousness was their dependence on or emphasis on the eye functioning in isolation.

[73] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 217. The caption, Richardson added, "is, moreover, audible, more intimately audible than the spoken word. It is the swift voice within the mind." In an earlier essay Richardson said that in some films, otherwise badly made, the captions actually were "the better part, presenting, bright and new, truths that in our keeping had grown a little dim." (Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 54)

[74] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", 56.

[75] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 55.

[76] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 216.

[77] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, III: Captions", 55.

[78] Richardson, "Films for Children", 25.

[79] Miller, "The Red Herring", 4.

[80] Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562. Elsewhere in 1933 Richardson, writing autobiographically, stated: "Being born in Berkshire should mean early acquaintance with woods and hills and rivers. It meant these things for me. Long before their names were known to me they had given that first direct knowledge which instruction and experience can amplify and deepen, but can never outdo." (Richardson, "Beginnings", 195)

[81] Richardson, "Beginnings", 195.

[82] Richardson, The Quakers Past and Present, 33-34.

[83] Ibid., 34.

[84] Ibid., 34.

[85] Ibid., 34.

[86] Ibid., 35.

[87] Ibid., 35.

[88] Ibid., 35.

[89] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVI]: A Tear for Lycidas", 200.

[90] Richardson, The Quakers Past and Present, 35-36.

[91] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIX]: The Film Gone Male", 37. Richardson often associated the meanings of the terms "masculine," "plan," and "becoming" with each other. Similarly, the words "feminine," "purpose," and "being" overlapped in meaning on the other end of her scale. Her use of the terms, "masculine" and "feminine," shall be examined in the subsequent chapter of this study.

[92] Riesman, "Film and Fiction", 359.

[93] See also Part Two, footnotes 91 and 107 of this study.

[94] Richardson, Deadlock, 100.

[95] The name, Hypo, is appropriate in the context of this novel. It suggests the chemical used for "fixing" photographic pictures. In Pilgrimage the masculine eye fixes rather than frees what it observes.

[96] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 361.

[97] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 315.

[98] Ibid., 316.

[99] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 279.

[100] Richardson, Deadlock, 207-208.

[101] Richardson, Interim, 316-317.

[102] Richardson, Dimple Hill, 549. Miriam recalls this occasion later, and again thinks that he "with his spy-glass focused in advance would be unable to see them." (Richardson, March Moonlight, 644)

[103] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 393.

[104] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIX]: The Film Gone Male", 36.

[105] Ibid., 36.

[106] Ibid., 38.

[107] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 280-281. In her "Foreword" to Pilgrimage Richardson wrote: "Feminine prose, as Charles Dickens and James Joyce have delightfully shown themselves to be aware, should properly be unpunctuated, moving from point to point without formal obstructions." (Richardson, "Foreword [1938]", 12)

[108] Richardson, *March Moonlight*, 613.

[109] Balázs, *Theory of the Film*, 40. This particular statement was originally made in *Der sichtbare Mensch* (19230, a portion of which is reprinted in *Theory of the Film* (pp. 39-45).

[110] Richardson, *March Moonlight*, 611.

[111] Richardson, *Dawn's Left Hand*, 220.

[112] Richardson, *Clear Horizon*, 361-362. It is a "smiling" proof which Miriam finally receives as final confirmation of having reached her goal.

[113] Richardson, *March Moonlight*, 635.

[114] Ibid., 638.

[115] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, VIII", 55.

[116] Richardson, *Clear Horizon*, 333.

[117] Richardson, *The Tunnel*, 109.

[118] Proust, *Remembrance of Things Past*, I, 815.

[119] Riesman, "Film and Fiction", 360.

[120] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", 32.

[121] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XX]", 131.

[122] Richardson, *Deadlock*, 182.

[123] Richardson, *Honeycomb*, 433.

[124] Ibid., 460.

[125] Richardson, *Interim*, 298.

[126] Ibid., 312.

[127] Ibid., 351-352.

[128] Ibid., 406.

[129] Richardson, Deadlock, 91.

[130] Ibid., 106.

[131] Ibid., 200.

[132] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 322.

[133] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 266.

[134] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 285.

[135] Ibid., 318.

[136] Ibid., 319.

[137] Ibid., 341.

[138] Ibid., 384-385.

[139] Ibid., 386.

[140] Richardson, Dimple Hill, 406.

[141] Ibid., 526.

[142] Richardson, March Moonlight, 595.

[143] Ibid., 610.

[144] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVI]: A Tear for Lycidas", 200.

[145] Richardson, Pointed Roofs, 42-43.

[146] Richardson, Oberland, 35.

[147] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 272.

[148] Ibid., 272.

[149] Richardson, Oberland, 36.

[150] Richardson, Honeycomb, 478.

[151] Richardson, Interim, 323.

[152] Richardson, The Tunnel, 13.

[153] Richardson, Honeycomb, 484.

[154] Richardson, Pointed Roofs, 150.

[155] Ibid., 150.

[156] Richardson, Interim, 298-299.

[157] Richardson, The Tunnel, 107.

[158] Ibid., 107.

[159] Richardson, Honeycomb, 431.

[160] Ibid., 431.

[161] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 368.

[162] Embler, "Flight", 313.

[163] Jealousy was published in French in 1957 and in English in 1965.

[164] Richardson, "Films for Children", 25-27.

[165] Richardson, Honeycomb, 416-417.

[166] Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562. Although Richardson was in principle opposed to the use of any labels, she resignedly admitted in 1938 that literary critics, following what she saw as the masculine-mode, would always need to categorize, and that the labels might as well be as useful as possible. Earlier, in 1933, she

had shown what she considered to be the logistical inaccuracy of the term, stream-of-consciousness. Writing in response to a question, she stated in 1933: "What do I think of the term 'Stream of Consciousness' as applied, in England, to the work of several modern novelists? Just this: that amongst the company of useful labels devised to meet the exigencies of literary criticism it stands alone, isolated by its perfect imbecility." (Richardson, "Autobiographical Sketch", 562) She did concede in the same statement that another term, the "transatlantic amendment, 'Interior Monologue,' tho rather more inadequate than even a label has any need to be, at least carries a meaning." In 1938 Richardson specified the other "transatlantic" term, "slow-motion photography." Of the three terms, Richardson said: "'The Stream of Consciousness' lyrically led the way, to be gladly welcomed by all who could persuade themselves of the possibility of comparing consciousness to a stream. Its transatlantic successors, 'Interior Monologue' and 'Slow-motion Photography,' may each be granted a certain technical applicability leaving them, to this extent, unhampered by the defects of their qualities." (Richardson, "Foreword [1938]", 11)

[167] Richardson, *The Tunnel*, 18. Balázs once wrote: "We know far more visual forms than sound forms. . . . [W]e so often see without hearing. We see things from afar, through a windowpane, on pictures, on photographs." (Balázs, *Theory of the Film*, 212)

[168] Richardson, *Honeycomb*, 448.

[169] Richardson, *The Tunnel*, 14-15.

[170] Above, pp. 60-61.

[171] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", 183.

[172] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVIII]: This Spoon-fed Generation?", 307.

[173] See Knight, *The Liveliest Art*, 149.

[174] Richardson, *Interim*, 324.

[175] Richardson, *The Tunnel*, 11.

[176] Ibid., 214.

[177] Richardson, Interim, 357.

[178] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 381-382.

[179] Richardson, Dimple Hill, 500.

[180] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 139.

[181] Ibid., 140.

[182] Ibid., 136.

[183] Ibid., 136.

[184] Ibid., 157.

[185] Ibid., 145.

[186] Ibid., 188.

[187] Richardson, Oberland. 62.

[188] Ibid., 63. Similarly the narrator says elsewhere that within a "rose-pink cake of fresh soap were safely stored the days to come." (Richardson, Dimple Hill, 435)

[189] Ibid., 62-63.

[190] Richardson, The Tunnel, 50.

[191] Richardson, Revolving Lights, 384.

[192] Richardson, "Beginnings", 195.

[193] Richardson, Honeycomb, 425.

[194] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 243.

[195] Richardson, The Tunnel, 136.

[196] Richardson, Deadlock, 106-107.

[197] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 155-156.

[198] Ibid., 156.

[199] Miller, "The Red Herring", 5.

[200] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", 185. What Richardson said about the landscape she might have said about music as well. Lewis, who took the opposite approach in this regard, wrote: "You move round the statue, but it is always there in its entirety before you: whereas the piece of music moves through you, as it were." (Lewis, Time and Western Man, 179)

[201] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 305.

[202] Richardson, Honeycomb, 394.

[203] Richardson, Interim, 425-426.

[204] Richardson, Deadlock, 114.

[205] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", 56.

[206] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, VIII", 54.

[207] Richardson, Deadlock, 215.

[208] Richardson, Oberland, 12.

[209] Ibid., 20.

[210] Ibid., 21.

[211] Ibid., 21.

[212] Ibid., 21.

[213] Ibid., 71.

[214] Ibid., 85.

[215] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, V: There's No Place Like Home", 47.

[216] Richardson, Oberland, 119.

[217] Ibid., 168.

[218] Richardson, March Moonlight, 635.

[219] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 258-259.

[220] Ibid., 261.

[221] Ibid., 265.

[222] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 282.

[223] Ibid., 282.

[224] Ibid., 279.

[225] Ibid., 281, 283.

[226] Ibid., 282.

[227] Ibid., 282.

[228] Ibid., 282.

[229] Ibid., 299.

[230] Ibid., 299-300.

[231] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 238.

[232] Richardson, Clear Horizon, 363.

[233] Richardson, Dimple Hill, 406.

[234] Ibid., 407.

[235] Ibid., 407. Having gained a fulfilling understanding of herself, Miriam becomes sensitive to experiences she has had of the parallel uniqueness and reality of others. For example, as she muses upon the "mind-view" she has had of her childhood home at Barnes, she

recalls the "sudden glimpse of reality" she had of her sister, Harriet, and of others: "Within the depths of that moment I seemed to gaze into her being. Aware of it as if it were my own. For the first time I realized the unique, solitary person behind the series of appearances that so far had represented in my mind the sister called Harriet. And as the scene vanished, its curious darkling spread, fading, across the world, showing me, as it moved, dim unknown figures as real as she." (Richardson, March Moonlight, 608-609)

[236] Richardson, The Tunnel, 13.

[237] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", 183-184.

[238] Richardson, Dimple Hill, 420-421.

[239] Richardson, "Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", 213.

[240] Richardson, Dawn's Left Hand, 238.

[241] Ibid., 238.

[242] Richardson, March Moonlight, 657.

[243] Ibid., 658.

PART THREE

[1] McLuhan, Understanding Media, 258.

[2] Zolla, The Eclipse of the Intellectual, 219-220.

[3] Lewis, The Apes of God, 402. It is Horace Zagreus who makes this statement in The Apes of God. He continues, speaking here as Lewis would have spoken: "For a decade everyone has grown accustomed to watching animated photographs of plays written for children, or for the least bright Nippy or domestic drudge. He could not help himself; if he went into any Cinema Theatre he was compelled to

swallow a mass of the bad with a fraction of good. . . . The film-play of Post-war is the homologue, upon the mental plane, of the War 'gasper,' from the standpoint of palate. And the thrillers of Edgar Wallace also are a sort of 'gaspers'. Mental 'gaspers'. . . . They are the "Gaspers' of this Peace--of this unhappy Truce. But if the average high-brow had not been broken in by the Film to unrelieved stupidity, then he could never have swallowed Wallace. . . . We are all rats caught in a colossal mechanical trap." (Lewis, The Apes of God, 403-405)

[4] Lewis, Men Without Art, 8-9.

[5] Lewis, Time and Western Man, Book II, Part I, Chapter II, "The philosophy of the instruments of research", pp. 160-165.

[6] Lewis, The Lion and the Fox, 41.

[7] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 83.

[8] Wees, Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde, 147. According to Wees, Helen Rowe was "an artist's model who knew Lewis well in 1914."

[9] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 81.

[10] Ibid., 218.

[11] Lewis, Doom of Youth, 207-208.

[12] Lewis, The Childermass, 182.

[13] Ibid., 10.

[14] Ibid., 11.

[15] Ibid., 78.

[16] Lewis, The Apes of God, 62.

[17] Ibid., 49.

[18] Ibid., 275.

[19] Lewis, Blasting and Bombardiering, 262.

[20] Lewis, *The Demon of Progress in the Arts*, 18.

[21] Ibid., 95.

[22] Lewis, *Monstre Gai*, 135. In *Malign Fiesta* (1955), the third volume of the trilogy, *The Human Age*, the references to Hollywood again represent the sensational and the vulgar (see, for example, pp. 368 and 440).

[23] Lewis, "Film Filibusters", 101.

[24] Ibid., 100.

[25] Ibid., 104.

[26] Ibid., 90.

[27] Ibid., 90.

[28] Lewis, *The Mysterious Mr. Bull*, 94.

[29] Lewis, *America and Cosmic Man*, 186.

[30] Ibid., 206. To illustrate what he saw as the wealth of talent poured out on the American radio networks Lewis listed, for example, Henry Aldrich, Amos and Andy, Jimmy Durante, Edgar Bergen, Jack Benny, Bing Crosby, and the American newscasts. These he also contrasted to what he saw as the inferior quality of British radio.

[31] Lewis, *Self Condemned*, 224.

[32] Lewis, *The Apes of God*, 538. "The Sovkino, which came into being in 1925, employ many directors, of whom the most important [is] S. M. Eisenstein. . . . They are the sole distributors of Soviet films abroad and the only importers of the foreign product." (Rotha, *The Film Till Now*, 226) Their studios were located at Leningrad and Moscow.

[33] Lewis, *The Red Priest*, 63.

[34] Lewis, *The Revenge for Love*, 161; and Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 320. Lewis associated *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* with drugs and the unconscious.

[35] Lewis, Paleface, 219. Metropolis provided a vision of the future societal problems of technological man.

[36] Lewis, The Apes of God, 376. Lewis, satirizing Lord Osmund and his company, wrote: "this Theoretic Underworld still shook in its criminal shoes, its Edgar Wallace teeth never ceased to chatter, its Potemkin heart was in its throat." (Lewis, The Apes of God, 376) See also Part Three, footnote 3.

[37] Lewis, The Childermass, 111.

[38] Lewis, Blasting and Bombardiering, 18.

[39] Lewis, Snooty Baronet, 216.

[40] Lewis, The Revenge for Love, 338. See also pp. 68, 86, 89, 297, 315, 332, and 370.

[41] Lewis, The Vulgar Streak, 34.

[42] Lewis, The Hitler Cult; Clark Gable is mentioned on page 103, Chaplin on page 80. The American movie tycoon, Adolph Zukor, and the German actor, Emil Jannings, are both referred to by Lewis on pages 114 and 255.

[43] Ibid., 25. In Self Condemned Lewis said of the keepers of the Hotel Blundell that "life was for [them] a cinema performance. A violent performance." (Lewis, Self Condemned, 209)

[44] Lewis, Hitler, 12.

[45] Lewis, The Hitler Cult, 6.

[46] Lewis, The Apes of God, 90.

[47] Lewis, Snooty Baronet, 44.

[48] Lewis, Self Condemned, 355.

[49] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 29.

[50] Zolla, The Eclipse of the Intellectual, 220.

[51] Lewis, Rude Assignment, 201.

[52] The second issue of Blast, the "war number," appeared in July, 1915.

[53] Lewis, Blasting and Bombardiering, 35. The "blast" to which I have made specific reference is found on page 18 of the first issue of Blast.

[54] Ibid., 35. Lewis was the leader of the Vorticist art movement in England. Lewis wrote in 1939: "The 'vorticist group' were a band of young painters led by myself, and established in 1914, to make England a land safe for a pictorial hero to live in. It did not succeed. . . . England continues to be a place highly unsafe for a pictorial hero to live in." (Lewis, Wyndham Lewis the Artist, 67)

[55] Ibid., 41.

[56] Tomlin, Wyndham Lewis: An Anthology, 16.

[57] Lewis, Rude Assignment, 129.

[58] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 127.

[59] Tomlin, Wyndham Lewis: An Anthology, 16.

[60] The revised version of Tarr appeared in 1928.

[61] Lewis, Rude Assignment, 148.

[62] Lewis, The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, 552-553.

[63] Lewis, The Demon of Progress in the Arts, 6. Although Lewis was here discussing painting, his term applies to writing as well.

[64] Ibid., 3.

[65] Pirandello, Shoot!, 85.

[66] Lewis, Self Condemned, 91.

[67] Lewis, The Writer and the Absolute, 38.

[68] Lewis, *Rotting Hill*, 198. These are Mark's words in the story, "Time the Tiger" (pp. 163-212). The title of the story is taken from the French existentialist film which is discussed in the story. In *Blasting and Bombardiering* Lewis provided another instance giving a sense of the pervasiveness of the cinema. He wrote light-heartedly: "The Press in 1914 has no Cinema, no Radio, and no Politics: so the painter could really become a 'star'." (Lewis, *Blasting and Bombardiering*, 39)

[69] Lewis, *America and Cosmic Man*, 16.

[70] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 96. Unless otherwise indicated, all references are to the first edition (1927).

[71] Lewis, *Time and Western Man* (Beacon paperback edition), viii. This is the only reference in this study to the "Preface" of the paperback edition. A part of this "Preface" is not included anywhere in the 1927 edition.

[72] Lewis, *Paleface*, 74-75.

[73] Lewis, *Rude Assignment*, 92.

[74] Lewis, *Tyro*, No. 2, 4-5.

[75] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 137.

[76] Lewis, *Hitler*, 136-137.

[77] Lewis, *Doom of Youth*, viii.

[78] Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled*, 87.

[79] Lewis, "Essay on the Objective of Plastic Art in Our Time", 36-37,

[80] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 414. In the "unconsciousness" of man, said Lewis, taking his figure of speech from the German Expressionistic film, "Dr. Freud, like a sort of mephistophelian Dr. Caligari, is waiting for him." (Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 320)

[81] "Classical Man--that inveterate 'spatializer'--was in love with *Plastic*. Modern, Western, 'Faustian' man, on the other hand, is pre-eminently interested in *Music*: he

spurns and abandons Plastic, and all its ways." (Lewis, Time and Western Man, 407)

[82] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 418.

[83] Ibid., 419, 420.

[84] Ibid., 419-420.

[85] Ibid., 432.

[86] Ibid., 432-433.

[87] Ibid., 432.

[88] Balázs, Theory of the Film, 147. Referring to what he called Sartre's "cyclone aesthetic" Lewis wrote: "My criticism would be this: what this fragmentary peepshow may gain in sensational intensity, it loses in the more comprehensive satisfactions which intensity rules out (or perhaps intensity is not the word but a technique of the naive close-up). Though it may feed--perhaps overfeed--the senses, it starves the intellect. Then since there is no person of vigorous mind who does not possess the will to understand, nor does anyone care to be left permanently in the dark, this method must always leave a disagreeable sensation, as also will its kaleidoscopic chaos." (Lewis, The Writer and the Absolute, 84)

[89] Lewis, Monstre Gai, 300-301. While the point of the incident remains much the same, it may be that Lewis was here thinking more of television--"it appeared to be lighted from within"--than film.

[90] Ibid., 301-302.

[91] Lewis, The Demon of Progress in the Arts, 46.

[92] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 208.

[93] Lewis, The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, 254.

[94] Ibid., 254. Lewis was here criticizing what he saw as the "mechanical" art of the Royal Academy.

[95] Ibid., 254.

[96] Ibid., 254.

[97] Ibid., 448.

[98] Lewis, Tyro, No. 2, 8.

[99] Lewis, The Demon of Progress in the Arts, 80.

[100] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 320.

[101] Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 400-402; also, quoted in Time and Western Man, 121-122. Having stated that the thought-stream or word-stream of Bloom's mind "was supposed to be photographed," Lewis added: "The effect was not unlike the conversation of Mr. Jingle in Pickwick." Lewis's explicit linking of Joyce, Dickens, and the cinema invites comparison with a similar clustering of associations brought forward by Eisenstein, especially in his essay, "Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today." (Eisenstein, Film Form, 195-255) In the work of these writers Eisenstein found in particular parallels to the cinema's use of montage. Lewis used the literary label, "naturalism," to define that quality in the work of these two writers which attracted the interest of Eisenstein. Lewis parodied Joyce with what he called the "dickensjingling" of the Bailiff, who says that he feels "bloomingasblooming." (Lewis, The Childermass, 272)

[102] Lewis, "Film Filibusters", 94.

[103] McLuhan, Understanding Media, 254.

[104] Lewis, The Diabolical Principle and the Dithyrambic Spectator, 67. In particular Lewis's argument was with the literary editors of Transition, fashionable proponents of Surrealism, who only played with the experiments of serious painters like Max Ernst and de Chirico, whose early work Lewis admired.

[105] Ibid., 65.

[106] Ibid., 65.

[107] Ibid., 68. The romantically "satanic" Lay of Maldorer had been written by the Comte de Lautréamont, a mid-nineteenth century French prose-poet.

[108] Lewis, Paleface, 95. Lewis took the quotation from Sherwood Anderson's A Story-Teller's Story.

[109] Lewis's original title for the novel, False Bottoms, emphasizes this theme. Pirandello, in his novel, Shoot! (1916), also used the cinema as an extended metaphor for the mutual breakdown of illusion and reality.

[110] Lewis, The Revenge for Love, 172.

[111] Ibid., 172-173.

[112] Ibid., 172.

[113] Ibid., 173-174.

[114] Ibid., 175, 175, 176, and 178.

[115] Lewis, The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, 188.

[116] Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 397.

[117] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 83, 84.

[118] Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 400.

[119] Ibid., 397.

[120] Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 47. Lewis illustrated his point further by referring to The Childermass: "For certain comic purposes it [the internal method] likewise has its uses (cf. The Childermass) especially when used in conjunction with a full-blooded Stein-stutter." (Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 47)

[121] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 127.

[122] Barry, "Three Films", 926.

[123] Lewis, The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, 191.

[124] Lewis, The Apes of God, 13-14. Fredigonde is 96 years old.

[125] Ibid., 21. In The Vulgar Streak (1941) Lewis made similar explicit associations between cinema and day-dreaming. The day-dream, made up of quickly shifting "inner scenes" and "mental pictures," is April Mallow's. Lewis wrote: "Her mental cinema was abruptly terminated by the arrival of her mother." (Lewis, Vulgar Streak, 20-24)

[126] Ibid., 18. In her "private cinema" Fredigonde finds herself exhibited upon a theatrical stage. The conjunction of film and stage, together with Fredigonde's histrionic cry of "Houp-la!" suggests that Lewis was here parodying contemporary experiments in the use of mixed-media, specifically Ernst Toller's use of stage and film in 1927 in his Hoppla, wir leben!

[127] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 432.

[128] Lewis, The Apes of God, 21.

[129] Ibid., 13.

[130] Ibid., 13.

[131] Ibid., 624.

[132] Ibid., 21.

[133] Ibid., 24.

[134] Ibid., 17.

[135] Ibid., 23.

[136] Ibid., 23-24.

[137] Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 47.

[138] Lewis, The Mysterious Mr. Bull, 151. Lewis wrote: "Charlie Chaplin's comedies have all been dope-dreams [that is, humorous not satirical]: the Nirvana of the Little Man. And the dwarfs of Walt Disney, with 'Dopey' at their centre, are just a herd of Little Men, instead of one Little Man." (Lewis, The Mysterious Mr. Bull, 148)

[139] For example, pp. 170-176 and the top of p. 272 of The Childermass.

[140] Swift, Gulliver's Travels, 74.

[141] Lewis, The Apes of God, 22.

[142] Ibid., 22.

[143] Ibid., 23.

[144] Ibid., 23.

[145] Ibid., 24.

[146] Lewis, The Wild Body, 246.

[147] Ibid., 250.

[148] Ibid., 238.

[149] Ibid., 239. Béla Balázs wrote that "the photographic caricature is more murderous [than the drawing] because it is more authentic." (Balázs, Theory of the Film, 104)

[150] Lewis, The Apes of God, 23.

[151] Ibid., 24.

[152] Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 46.

[153] Ibid., 46.

[154] Ibid., 48. Lewis's references to natural science varied significantly in application from time to time. The term, natural science, related to the way of seeing of the camera, describes at different times the Lewisian satire as well as the stream-of-consciousness mode. In The Art of Being Ruled Lewis associated the inside of things with natural science: "The more art goes to science for its inspiration, the more of the inside of things, and the less of the outside of things, it will get into its shop. I have defined art as the science of the outside of things, and natural science as the science of the inside of things." (Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 403)

Lewis clarified his use of the terms in Time and

Western Man. Here, having first discussed scientific naturalism as the mode of Ulysses, he said: "there are so many varieties of naturalism. Some scientific naturalism does deal with things from the outside, indeed, and so achieves a very different effect--one of hardness, not of softness. But the method of Ulysses imposes a softness, flabbiness and vagueness everywhere in its bergsonian fluidity." (Lewis, Time and Western Man, 120)

In any case, the "truth" of Natural Science itself is only a style of truth. Speaking of fiction writers Lewis (as Zagreus) said in The Apes of God: "the more the average person is invested with the signs and powers of a super-human impartiality, the more partisan--more partial and human, he is sure, in fact, to be. Instinctively he uses the 'impersonality' presented him by natural science." (Lewis, The Apes of God, 260) He cautioned: "The 'impersonality' of science and 'objective' observation is a wonderful patent behind which the individual can indulge in a riot of personal egotism, impossible to earlier writers, not provided with such a disguise." (Lewis, The Apes of God, 260) He pointed out the irony: "The air of being 'scientific' and the paraphernalia of 'detachment,' used by the average literary workman, result in something the opposite of what you are led to anticipate. The fiction produced in this manner becomes more personal than ever before. . . . [A] mask of impersonality merely removes the obligation to be a little truly detached." (Lewis, The Apes of God, 259)

[155] Ibid., 48.

[156] Ibid., 46.

[157] Ibid., 46. The same critic, Montgomery Belgion, spoke of the Kein episode in The Apes of God as one in which "the whole thing is somehow made to stand still, as if it were a slowly-unwound film: it is like a picture." ("Have with you to Great Queen Street!"; see Satire and Fiction, 31)

[158] Ibid., 49.

[159] Lewis, "Introduction", n. pag.

[160] Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 52.

[161] Ibid., 52-53.

[162] Ibid., 49.

[163] Isaacs, An Assessment of Twentieth-Century Literature, 124.

[164] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 119.

[165] Ibid., 106.

[166] Ibid., 16. Lewis was here quoting Alexander Moszkowski, Einstein's "Boswell," who in 1921 wrote Einstein: Einblicke in seine Gedankenwelt, a work which grew out of his conversations with Einstein.

[167] Bergson, Creative Evolution, 331.

[168] Ibid., 332.

[169] Ibid., 332.

[170] Ibid., 334.

[171] Ibid., 357.

[172] Ibid., 343.

[173] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 168.

[174] Bergson, Creative Evolution, 360.

[175] Ibid., 361.

[176] Eadweard Muybridge began making "series pictures" which were analyses of the motion of, first, horses, as early as 1877 in California.

[177] Bergson, Creative Evolution, 361.

[178] McLuhan, Understanding Media, 254.

[179] Bergson, Creative Evolution, 366.

[180] Ibid., 374.

[181] Ibid., 374.

[182] Ibid., 372.

[183] Ibid., 372.

[184] Ibid., 373.

[185] Ibid., 374.

[186] Embler, "Flight", 310.

[187] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 169.

[188] Ibid., 171.

[189] Ibid., 181.

[190] Ibid., 171-172.

[191] Ibid., 212.

[192] Ibid., 179. In a description which is interesting both in itself, and as a point of comparison between Lewis's and Dorothy Richardson's attitudes toward music and its usefulness, Lewis discussed the mutual exclusiveness of the visual (plastic, concrete) and the aural (musical, emotional) modes of expression by referring to abstract art: "You know what my feeling about 'abstract art' is. To reduce the material of the visual world to the abstractness of a musical composition is quite impossible. What you get if you attempt to do so, is inescapably concrete. It has been tried out, and the results are unsatisfactory. The visual has not the emotional appeal of the aural: another difficulty. Very nice effects can be obtained in the course of such attempts heroically to abstract, but, in the mass the effect is very empty." (Lewis, The Letters of Wyndham Lewis, 361)

[193] Ibid., 449.

[194] Ibid., 434.

[195] Ibid., 168.

[196] Ibid., 453.

[197] Ibid., 435.

[198] Ibid., 453.

[199] Ibid., 443-444.

[200] Ibid., 445.

[201] Ibid., 103.

[202] Ibid., 178-179.

[203] Lewis recalled in *Blasting and Bombardiering* that during his "Blast period" (1914-1915) he was often called a Futurist, "though," he said, "this was a misnomer." (Lewis, *Blasting and Bombardiering*, 26)

[204] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 181.

[205] Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled*, 386. In the same work he added: "Within the dominions, generally speaking, of the Great God Flux, are to be found . . . the psychoanalysts, futurists, dadas, proustites, etc." (Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled*, 397) He noted too with some humour: "[Bergson's] philosophy of movement and change makes him the best spokesman of the life lived by the typical american business man." (Lewis, *The Art of Being Ruled*, 386) In *The Childermass* Hyperides sees the Bailiff as a futurist-magician figure: "With your convex and concave mirrors and with your witches' cauldron, Time, into which you cast all the objects of sense, softening and confusing them in your 'futurist' or time-obsessed alchemy, are you not faithful to the traditions of the magician?" (Lewis, *The Childermass*, 150) The Bailiff's heaven recreates the essence of Lewis's interpretation of the bergsonian universe. There, one is denied one's will, and becomes a "static souvenir" of one's self, or, as the Bailiff tells Macrob, a "habit of a habit--of a Habit." (Lewis, *The Childermass*, 230, 224)

[206] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 175.

[207] Ibid., 181.

[208] Ibid., 175.

[209] Ibid., 213.

[210] Lewis, *Blast*, No. 1, 8.

[211] Lewis, *The Apes of God*, 28.

[212] Ibid., 44.

[213] Lewis, *The Revenge for Love*, 370.

[214] Ibid., 350-351.

[215] Ibid., 358-359.

[216] Ibid., 359.

[217] Ibid., 359-361.

[218] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 435.

[219] Ibid., 118.

[220] Pirandello, *Shoot!*, 105-106.

[221] Lewis, *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis*, 540.

[222] Yeats, in Carter, "Rationalist in Hell", 326.

[223] Lewis, *The Childermass*, 3.

[224] McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, 31.

[225] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 120. It is informative to note that Dorothy Richardson, writing of novelists such as Joyce, suggested that the reader, for what she called a reward of "sheer delight" and "inexhaustible entertainment," should "plunge, provisionally, here and there: *enter* the text and look innocently about." (Richardson, "Adventure for Readers", 51)

[226] Ibid., 414. Lewis wrote in *The Art of Being Ruled*: "Bergson is throughout recommending capitulation to the material *in struggle against which* the greatest things in the world *have been* constructed. This fashionable, unskeletal, feminine philosopher of the flux wished (with more chance of succeeding than the merely very noisy

Marinetti) to deliver all this up to the river-god, to the god Flux, once more.

I am an artist, and, through my eye, must confess to a tremendous bias. In my purely literary voyages my eye is always my compass. 'The architectural simplicity'--whether of a platonic idea or a greek temple--I far prefer to no idea at all, no temple at all, or, for instance, to most of the complicated and too tropical structures of India. Nothing could ever convince my EYE--even if my intelligence were otherwise overcome--that anything that did not possess this simplicity, conceptual quality, hard exact outline, grand architectural proportion, was the greatest art. Bergson is indeed the arch enemy of every impulse having its seat in the apparatus of vision, and requiring a concrete world. Bergson is the enemy of the Eye, from the start; though he might arrive at some emotional compromise with the Ear. But I can hardly imagine any way in which he is not against every form of intelligent life." (Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 391)

[227] Lewis, Satire and Fiction, 47.

[228] Lewis, The Childermass, 3.

[229] Ibid., 32.

[230] Ibid., 32.

[231] Ibid., 80.

[232] Ibid., 14-15.

[233] Lewis, Snooty Baronet, 163. The words are Snooty's, spoken in the context of his self-realization about the implications of behaviorist perspective. Behaviorism, Lewis wrote in Paleface, "is just the extreme gospel of the Machine Age." (Lewis, Paleface, 161)

[234] Lewis, The Childermass, 12.

[235] Ibid., 14.

[236] Ibid., 17.

[237] Ibid., 14.

[238] Lewis, Doom of Youth, xiii.

[239] Lewis, "Film Filibusters", 91 This is Lewis's description of a French film crew which was shooting on location in Morocco.

[240] Lewis, The Childermass, 33.

[241] Ibid., 15.

[242] Ibid., 15.

[243] Ibid., 13.

[244] Ibid., 13.

[245] Ibid., 14.

[246] H. D., "The Cinema and the Classics--I--Beauty", 23. H. D. is here giving not her own view but that of what she called the "vast horde of the fair-to-middling intellectuals."

[247] Lewis, The Childermass, 15.

[248] Ibid., 16.

[249] Ibid., 15-16.

[250] Ibid., 17.

[251] Ibid., 17-18.

[252] Ibid., 18.

[253] Ibid., 18-19.

[254] Ibid., 19.

[255] Ibid., 19.

[256] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 414.

[257] Lewis, The Childermass, 20.

[258] Ibid., 20.

[259] Ibid., 20.

[260] Lewis, *Time and Western Man*, 232.

[261] Ibid., 170.

[262] Lewis, *The Childermass*, 21.

[263] Ibid., 21-22.

[264] Ibid., 24.

[265] Ibid., 24-25.

[266] Ibid., 25.

[267] Ibid., 25.

[268] Ibid., 23.

[269] Ibid., 23.

[270] Ibid., 24.

[271] Ibid., 24.

[272] Ibid., 26.

[273] Ibid., 26.

[274] Ibid., 26.

[275] Ibid., 26.

[276] Ibid., 26.

[277] Ibid., 27.

[278] Ibid., 27.

[279] Ibid., 27.

[280] Ibid., 29.

[281] Ibid., 30.

[282] Ibid., 30.

[283] Ibid., 30.

[284] Ibid., 30.

[285] Ibid., 31.

[286] Ibid., 31.

[287] Ibid., 31.

[288] Zolla, The Eclipse of the Intellectual, 102.

[289] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 238.

[290] Ibid., 239.

[291] Ibid., 240.

[292] Ibid., 170.

[293] Ibid., 216.

[294] Ibid., 265.

[295] Ibid., 231. Much of The Childermass is devoted to a fictional reconstruction of the kind of time-world which Lewis described in Time and Western Man. Lewis noted, too, in The Lion and the Fox: "They [men of the Italian renaissance] attempted to bring to life the heroes of antiquity, and recall in their own lives the events recorded in the codices, and it was this immediate application of everything to life in italian renaissance society (like the substitution of a cinema for a history-book in a school) that made the italian influence so vivid in the rest of Europe. Renaissance Italy was very exactly a kind of Los Angeles, where historical scenes were tried out, antique buildings imitated and roughly run up, and dramatic crimes reconstructed." (Lewis, The Lion and the Fox, 86-87)

[296] Ibid., 231.

[297] Ibid., 232-233.

[298] Ibid., 256.

[299] Ibid., 233.

[300] Ibid., 109. Of Proust Lewis wrote: "Proust embalmed himself alive. He died as a sensational creature in order that he should live as an historian of his dead sensational self, which expired about the time that lyrical poets are supposed to snuff out. . . . That was his way of making himself into an historical personage, by embalming himself in a mechanical medium of 'time.'" (Lewis, Time and Western Man, 265)

[301] Ibid., 108.

[302] Lewis's sensuousness is that of the common-sense. Bergson's "is the doctrine of sensation for sensation's sake." (Lewis, The Art of Being Ruled, 386)

[303] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 410.

[304] Ibid., 408-409. Lewis added: "This insistence upon succession [or movement] does, although the field is a visual one, approach this theory much more to the art of music, for instance, than to the world of painting, or the pictorial, visual, arts. A world of motion is a world of music, if anything. No visual artist would ever have imagined (or had he imagined, he would have turned in horror from) such a world as the bergsonian, relativist world." (Lewis, Time and Western Man, 410)

[305] Ibid., 266.

[306] Ibid., 266.

[307] Ibid., 101.

[308] Lewis, Monstre Gai, 219.

[309] Lewis, The Childermass, 82.

[310] Ibid., 82.

[311] Ibid., 91.

[312] Ibid., 95.

[313] Ibid., 97.

[314] Lewis, Time and Western Man, 231.

[315] Lewis, The Childermass, 96.

[316] Ibid., 94.

[317] Ibid., 95.

[318] Ibid., 94.

[319] Ibid., 96.

[320] Ibid., 92.

[321] Ibid., 103.

[322] Ibid., 103.

[323] Ibid., 103.

[324] Ibid., 103.

[325] Ibid., 103.

[326] Zolla, The Eclipse of the Intellectual, 213.

[327] Lewis, The Childermass, 137. London, Lewis said in Rude Assignment, "would have looked like sets for a movie about Babylon." (Lewis, Rude Assignment, 155)

[328] Ibid., 140-141.

[329] Ibid., 139.

[330] Ibid., 137.

[331] Ibid., 137.

[332] Ibid., 144.

[333] Ibid., 144.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

A. W. "Finis", *Close Up*, IV, 4 (April 1929), 80.

Allen, Walter. "Introduction", in *Pilgrimage*, 4 vols. London: Dent, 1967.

Anderson, Sherwood, *A Story-Teller's Story*. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1924.

Anon. "Miss Richardson's New Novel", *Spectator*, CXXVI (March 26, 1921), 403.

Anon. "Novels", *London Mercury*, I, 4 (February 1920), 473-476.

Anon. "The Tunnel", *Spectator*, CXXII (March 15, 1919), 330-331.

Artaud, Antonin. "The Shell and the Clergyman", tr. Stuart Gilbert, *Transition*, No. 19-20 (June 1930), 63-69.

Balázs, Béla. *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art*, tr. Edith Bone. London: Dennis Dobson, 1952.

Beach, Joseph Warren. *The Twentieth-Century Novel: Studies in Technique*. New York and London: Century, 1932.

Bennett, Arnold. "The Film 'Story'", *Close Up*, I, 6 (December 1927), 27-32.

Bergson, Henri. *Creative Evolution* (1907), tr. Arthur Mitchell. New York: Modern Library, 1944 (1911).

Bluestone, George. *Novels Into Film: The Metamorphosis of Fiction into Cinema*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966 (1957).

Bryher. *The Heart to Artemis: A Writer's Memoirs*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962

Carter, Huntly. *The New Spirit in the Cinema*. London: Harold Shaylor, 1930.

Carter, Thomas H. "Rationalist in Hell", *Kenyon Review*, XVIII, 2 (Spring 1956), 326-336.

Collins, Joseph. "Dorothy Richardson and her Censor", in *The Doctor Looks at Literature: Psychological Studies in Life and Letters*. New York: Doran, 1923.

Costello, Donald P. *The Serpent's Eye: Shaw and the Cinema*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.

Deer, Irving. "Strindberg's Dream Vision: Prelude to the Film", *Criticism*, XIV (Summer 1972), 253-265.

Dukore, Bernard F., ed. *Saint Joan: A Screenplay by Bernard Shaw*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1968.

Edel, Leon. "Novels of Influence--VII: Dorothy Richardson: Feminine Realist", *Times Educational Supplement* (June 1, 1956), 743.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Form* (1949), in *Film Form and The Film Sense*, tr. Jay Leyda. Cleveland and New York: World, 1967.

Eisenstein, Sergei, V. I. Pudovkin, and G. V. Alexandrov. "A Statement" (1928), in *Film Form and The Film Sense*, tr. Jay Leyda. Cleveland and New York: World, 1967.

Eliot, T. S. "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock", in *Prufrock and Other Observations*. London: The Egoist Ltd., 1917.

Embler, Weller. "Flight: A Study of Time and Philosophy and the Arts in the Twentieth Century", *Arts in Society*, VIII, 1 (Spring-Summer 1971), 307-322.

Erskine, Thomas L., ed. *Literature/Film Quarterly*, I, 1 (January 1973).

Geduld, Harry M., ed. *Authors on Film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

George, W. L. "A Painter's Literature", *English Review*, XXX (March 1920), 223-234.

--------. "W. L. George", *The Future of the Novel: Famous Authors on their Methods: A Series of Interviews with Renowned Authors*, ed. Meredith Starr. London: Heath Cranton, 1921.

Gessner, Robert. The Moving Image: A Guide to Cinematic Literacy. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1970.

Glikin, Gloria. "Dorothy M. Richardson: The Personal 'Pilgrimage'", PMLA, LXXVIII (December 1963), 586-600.

H. D. "The Cinema and the Classics--I--Beauty", Close Up, I, 1 (July 1927), 22-33.

--------. "Russian Films", Close Up, III, 3 (September 1928), 18-29.

Humphrey, Robert. Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955.

Hyde, Lawrence. "The Work of Dorothy Richardson", Adelphi, II, 6 (November 1924), 508-517.

Isaacs, J. An Assessment of Twentieth-Century Literature. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1968 (1951).

Isherwood, Christopher. Lions and Shadows: An Education in the Twenties. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1947.

Jones, Robert Edmond. The Dramatic Imagination: Reflections and Speculations on the Art of the Theatre. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1965 (1941)

Joyce, James. Letters of James Joyce, ed. Stuart Gilbert. New York: Viking, 1957.

--------. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. New York: Viking, 1964 (1916).

--------. Ulysses. New York: Random House, 1966 (1922).

Knight, Arthur. The Liveliest Art. New York and Toronto: New American Library, 1957.

Langer, Susanne. "A Note on Film", Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

Levin, Harry. James Joyce: A Critical Introduction. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1960.

Lewis, Wyndham. America and Cosmic Man. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1948.

--------. The Apes of God. London: Nash and Grayson, n. d. [1931].

--------. *The Art of Being Ruled*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1926.

--------, ed. *Blast*. Nos. 1 and 2 (June 1914 and July 1915).

--------. *Blasting and Bombardiering*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1937.

--------. *The Childermass: Section I*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1928.

--------. *The Demon of Progress in the Arts*. London: Methuen, 1955.

--------. *The Diabolical Principle and the Dithyrambic Spectator*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1931.

--------. *Doom of Youth*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1932.

--------. *Enemy of the Stars*. London: Desmond Harmsworth, 1932 (the original version appeared in *Blast*, No. 1 (1914)).

--------. "Essay on the Objective of Plastic Art in Our Time", *Tyro*, No. 2 [1922], 21-37.

--------. "Film Filibusters", in *Filibusters in Barbary (Record of a Visit to the Sous)*. London: Grayson and Grayson, 1932.

--------. *Hitler*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1931.

--------. *The Hitler Cult*. London: Dent, 1939.

--------. "Introduction" (1954), in *The Apes of God*. London: Arco, 1955.

--------. *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis*, ed. W. K. Rose. London: Methuen, 1955.

--------. *The Lion and the Fox: The rôle of the hero in the plays of Shakespeare*. London: Methuen, 1966 (1927).

--------. *Malign Fiesta*, Book Three of *The Human Age*. London: Methuen, 1955.

--------. *Men Without Art*. London: Cassell, 1934.

--------. *Monstre Gai*, Book Two of *The Human Age*. London: Methuen, 1955.

---------. *The Mysterious Mr. Bull*. London: Robert Hale, 1938.

---------. *Paleface: The Philosophy of the "Melting-Pot."* London: Chatto and Windus, 1929.

---------. *The Red Priest*. London: Methuen, 1956.

---------. *The Revenge for Love*. London: Methuen, 1952 (1937).

---------. *Rotting Hill*. London: Methuen, 1951.

---------. *Rude Assignment: A narrative of my career up-to-date*. London: Hutchinson, 1951.

---------. *Satire and Fiction*, preceded by *"Have with you to Great Queen Street!" The History of a Rejected Review by Roy Campbell*. London: The Arthur Press, [1930].

---------. *Self Condemned*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1965 (1954).

---------. *Snooty Baronet*. London: Cassell, 1932.

---------. *Tarr*. London: The Egoist Ltd., 1918.

---------. *Time and Western Man*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1927.

---------. *Time and Western Man*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957 (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928).

---------, ed. *Tyro: A Review of the Arts of Painting Sculpture and Design*. Nos. 1 and 2 [1921 and 1922].

---------. *The Vulgar Streak*. London: Robert Hale, 1941.

---------. *The Wild Body: A Soldier of Humour and Other Stories*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1927.

---------. *The Writer and the Absolute*. London: Methuen, 1952.

---------. *Wyndham Lewis the Artist: From "Blast" to Burlington House*. London: Laidlaw and Laidlaw, 1939.

Lindsay, Vachel. *The Art of the Moving Picture*. New York: Liveright, 1970 (1922) (original version, 1915).

Low, Rachael. *The History of the British Film: 1906-1914*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1949.

--------. The History of the British Film: 1918-1929. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.

Lowry, Malcolm. Dark as the Grave Wherein My Friend is Laid. Toronto: General, 1968.

--------. October Ferry to Gabriola. New York and Cleveland: World, 1970.

--------. "Preface to a Novel" (1948), tr. George Woodcock, Canadian Literature, No. 9 (Summer 1961), 23-29.

--------. Selected Letters of Malcolm Lowry, eds. Harvey Breit and Margerie Bonner Lowry. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1965.

--------. Under the Volcano, introd. Stephen Spender. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1965 (1947).

--------. Unpublished letter to Herr Clenens ten Holder, dated Dollarton, British Columbia, October 31, 1951. Special Collections, University of British Columbia Library.

-------- and Margerie Bonner Lowry. "Tender is the Night", unpublished film script. Special Collections, University of British Columbia Library.

McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. Toronto: New American Library, 1968 (1964).

Magny, Claude-Edmonde. The Age of the American Novel: The Film Aesthetic of Fiction Between the Two Wars (1948), tr. Eleanor Hochman. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1972.

Maisel, E. M. "Dorothy M. Richardson's Pilgrimage", Canadian Forum, XIX (April 1939), 89-92.

Mendilow, A. A. Time and the Novel, introd. J. Isaacs. London: Peter Nevill, 1952.

Miller, Henry. "The Red Herring and the Diamond-backed Terrapin", in Art in Cinema, ed. Frank Stauffacher. [San Francisco]: Art in Cinema Society, San Francisco Museum of Art, 1947.

Montagu, Ivor. With Eisenstein in Hollywood. New York: International Publishers, 1969.

Morrissette, Bruce. "Cinema and Literature", in *Encyclopedia of World Literature in the 20th Century*, ed. Wolfgang Bernard Fleischmann. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1967.

--------. "Surfaces and Structures in Robbe-Grillet's Novels", in *Two Novels by Robbe-Grillet*. New York: Grove Press, 1965 (1958).

Murray, Edward. *The Cinematic Imagination: Writers and the Motion Pictures*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1972.

Murry, John Middleton. "The Break-Up of the Novel", *Yale Review*, XII (October 1922), 288-304.

Pirandello, Luigi. *Shoot! (Si Gira): The Notebooks of Serafino Gubbio, Cinematograph Operator* (1916), tr. C. K. Scott Moncrieff. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1926.

Proust, Marcel. *Remembrance of Things Past*, 2 vols., tr. C. K. Scott Moncrieff (*The Past Recaptured*, tr. Frederick A. Blossom). New York: Random House, 1934.

Richardson, Dorothy M. "Adventure for Readers", *Life and Letters To-Day*, XXII, 23 (July 1939), 45-52.

--------. "The Artist and the World To-day", *Bookman*, LXXXVI (May 1934), 94.

--------. "Autobiographical Sketch", in *Authors Today and Yesterday*, ed. Stanley J. Kunitz. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1933.

--------. "Beginnings: A Brief Sketch", in *Ten Contemporaries: Notes Toward their Definitive Bibliography* (second series), ed. John Gawsworth. London: Joiner and Steele, 1933.

--------. "The Censorship Petition", *Close Up*, VI, 1 (January 1930), 7-11.

--------. "Confessions", *Little Review*, XII, 2 (May 1929), 70-71.

--------. "Continuous Performance", *Close Up* (the essays are here chronologically arranged):
    "Continuous Performance, [I]", *Close Up*, I, 1 (July 1927), 34-37.
    "Continuous Performance, II: Musical Accompaniment", *Close Up*, I, 2 (August 1927), 58-62.

"Continuous Performance, III: Captions", *Close Up*, I, 3 (September 1927), 52-56.

"Continuous Performance, IV: A Thousand Pities", *Close Up*, I, 4 (October 1927), 60-64.

"Continuous Performance, V: There's No Place Like Home", *Close Up*, I, 5 (November 1927), 44-47.

"Continuous Performance, VI: The Increasing Congregation", *Close Up*, I, 6 (December 1927), 61-65.

"Continuous Performance, VII: The Front Rows", *Close Up*, II, 1 (January 1928), 59-64.

"Continuous Performance, VIII", *Close Up*, II, 3 (March 1928), 51-55.

"Continuous Performance, IX: The Thoroughly Popular Film", *Close Up*, II, 4 (April 1928), 44-50.

"Continuous Performance, X: The Cinema in the Slums", *Close Up*, II, 5 (May 1928), 58-62.

"Continuous Performance, XI: Slow Motion", *Close Up*, II, 6 (June 1928), 54-58.

"Continuous Performance, XII: The Cinema in Arcady", *Close Up*, III, 1 (July 1928), 52-57.

"Continuous Performance, [XIII]: Pictures and Films", *Close Up*, IV, 1 (January 1929), 51-57.

"Continuous Performance, [XIV]: Almost Persuaded", *Close Up*, IV, 6 (June 1929), 31-37.

"Continuous Performance, [XV]: Dialogue in Dixie", *Close Up*, V, 3 (September 1929), 211-218.

"Continuous Performance, [XVI]: A Tear for Lycidas", *Close Up*, VII, 3 (September 1930), 196-202.

"Continuous Performance, [XVII]: Narcissus", *Close Up*, VIII, 3 (September 1931), 182-185.

"Continuous Performance, [XVIII]: This Spoon-fed Generation?", *Close Up*, VIII, 4 (December 1931), 304-308.

"Continuous Performance, [XIX]: The Film Gone Male", *Close Up*, IX, 1 (March 1932), 36-38.

"Continuous Performance, [XX]", *Close Up*, X, 2 (June 1933), 130-132.

--------. "Data for Spanish Publisher" (1943), ed. Joseph Prescott. *London Magazine*, VI (June 1959), 14-19.

--------. "Films for Children", *Close Up*, III, 2 (August 1928), 21-27.

--------. "Foreword" (1938), in *Pilgrimage*, 4 vols. London: Dent, 1967.

--------. "Novels", *Life and Letters and The London Mercury*, LVI (March 1948), 188-192.

--------. *Pilgrimage*, 4 vols. London: Dent, 1967 (*Pointed Roofs*, 1915; *Backwater*, 1916; *Honeycomb*, 1917; *The Tunnel*, 1919; *Interim*, 1919; *Deadlock*, 1921; *Revolving Lights*, 1923; *The Trap*, 1935; *Oberland*, 1927; *Dawn's Left Hand*, 1931; *Clear Horizon*, 1935; *Dimple Hill*, 1938; *March Moonlight*, 1967).

--------. *The Quakers Past and Present*. London: Constable, 1914.

--------. "Seven Letters from Dorothy M. Richardson" (1950-1951), *Yale University Library Gazette*, XXXIII, 3 (January 1959), 102-111.

--------. "Talkies, Plays and Books: Thoughts on the Approaching Battle Between the Spoken Pictures, Literature and the Stage", *Vanity Fair*, XXXII (August 1929), 56.

Richardson, Robert. *Literature and Film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Riesman, Evelyn T. "Film and Fiction", *Antioch Review*, XVII, 3 (September 1957), 353-363.

Robbe-Grillet, Alain. *For a New Novel: Essays on Fiction*. New York: Grove Press, 1965.

--------. *Jealousy* (1957), in *Two Novels by Robbe-Grillet*, tr. Richard Howard. New York: Grove Press, 1965.

Rotha, Paul. *The Film Till Now: A Survey of World Cinema*, with an additional section by Richard Griffith. Great Britain: Spring Books, 1967 (1930).

Ryf, Robert. *A New Approach to Joyce: The Portrait of the Artist as a Guidebook*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.

Seldes, Gilbert. "The Abstract Movie", *New Republic*, XLVIII (September 15, 1926), 95-96.

Shattuck, Roger. *The Banquet Years: The Origins of the Avant-garde in France: 1885 to World War I*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1969 (1955).

Shaw, George Bernard. "The Drama, the Theatre and the Films: A Dialogue between Bernard Shaw and Archibald Henderson, his Biographer", *Fortnightly Review*, CXVI (September 1924), 289-302.

--------. "My First Talkie", in *Shaw on Theatre*, ed. E. J. West. New York: Hill and Wang, 1958.

Sinclair, May. "The Novels of Dorothy Richardson", *Egoist*, V (April 1918), 57-59.

Stein, Gertrude. *Lectures in America*. New York: Random House, 1935.

Stephenson, Ralph and J. R. Debrix. *The Cinema as Art*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969 (1965).

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Louis A. Landa. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960 (1726).

Taylor, A. J. P. *English History: 1914-1945*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970 (1965).

Tolstoy, Leo. "Conversation concerning the future of the cinema" (1908), tr. David Bernstein. *New York Times* (January 31, 1937), Section 11, p. 4; also in Leyda, Jay. *Kino: A History of the Russian and Soviet Film*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1960.

Tomlin, E. W. F., ed. *Wyndham Lewis: An Anthology of his Prose*. London: Methuen, 1969.

Wagenknecht, Edward. *Cavalcade of the English Novel: From Elizabeth to George VI*. New York: Henry Holt, 1954 (1943).

Wees, William C. *Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Wells, H. G. *The King who was a King*. London: Ernest Benn, 1929.

Woolf, Virginia. "Modern Fiction", in *The Common Reader*. London: Leonard and Virginia Woolf, 1925.

---------. "The Movies and Reality", *New Republic*, August 4, 1926, 308-310; also published as "The Cinema", *Nation and Athenaem*, July 3, 1926, 381-383.

Zolla, Elémire. *The Eclipse of the Intellectual* (1956 and 1962), tr. Raymond Rosenthal. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.